Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XXV, Nos. 6, 7 & 8. OCTOBER, 1935.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
ASSISTANT EDITOR: M. T. DUNLOP, M.A.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: ITS CONSTITUTION, CHARACTER AND CALL.

BY

THE VERY REV. W. R. MATTHEWS

THE REV. R. D. RICHARDSON

THE REV. PROF. CREED THE REV. J. F. CLAYTON

THE REV. PROF. NORMAN SYKES G. G. COULTON

THE REV. CHANCELLOR J. S. BEZZANT

THE REV. E. C. RATCLIFF ROBERT C. NESBITT

THE REV. A. C. BOUQUET THE REV. L. B. CROSS

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. EDMUNDSBURY AND IPSWICH

DR. DOUGLAS WHITE

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 3/6 net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

Two Comfortable London Hotels

NOW UNDER SAME MANAGEMENT

WEST CENTRAL HOTEL

SOUTHAMPTON ROW, W.C.1

ROOM, BATH and BREAKFAST 8/6

Minimum of 3 days
Full Board - 13/- per day
Partial Board - 11/- „

TURNER'S HOTEL

GUILFORD STREET, RUSSELL SQUARE, W.C.1

ROOM, BATH and BREAKFAST 7/6 TO 8/6

Minimum of 3 days
Full Board - 12/6 per day
Partial Board - 10/6 „

Both these Hotels are NOTED FOR GOOD FOOD, COMFORTABLE ROOMS and PERSONAL SERVICE

Apply for accommodation to W. WILLMOTH, Manager.

Two Popular Hotels in Central London

OPPOSITE THE BRITISH MUSEUM

THACKERAY HOTEL

Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1

NEAR THE BRITISH MUSEUM

KINGSLEY HOTEL

Hart Street, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C.1

200 Rooms in each Hotel Comfort and Refinement

Hot and Cold Water and Electric Fires in all Bedrooms a number of which are fitted with PRIVATE BATHROOMS

BEDROOM, BATH AND BREAKFAST FROM 8/6 PER NIGHT

Illustrated Booklet "Walks in Old London" on application

Telegrams:—

THACKERAY HOTEL: **'Thackeray, London'** KINGSLEY HOTEL: **'Bookcraft, London'**

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 6, 7 & 8. SEPT., OCT., NOV., 1935. Vol. XXV.

THE TWENTY-SECOND CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: ITS CONSTITUTION, CHARACTER AND CALL

By the Editor.

THIS number of the *Modern Churchman* contains all the papers that were read at the twenty-second annual Conference of Modern Churchmen held at Girton College, Cambridge, August 26th—31st, 1935.

The theme of the Conference was 'The Constitution, Character and Call of the Church of England.' The titles of the papers and the names of their contributors are as follows :—

The Presidential Address : *The Church of the Living God.* The Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, D.D., D.Litt., K.C.V.O.

The Doctrinal Characteristics of the Church of England. The Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.

The Relation of the Church to the Nation. The Rev. Professor Creed, D.D.

Problems of Church of England Membership. The Rev. J. F. Clayton, M.C., M.A., Reader of the Temple.

The Anglican Tradition of the Office and Work of a Bishop. The Rev. Professor NORMAN SYKES, M.A., D.Phil.

The English Layman. G. G. COULTON, D.Litt., F.B.A.

The Training of the Clergy. The Rev. Chancellor J. S. BEZZANT, B.D.

The Church Assembly. The Rev. E. C. RATCLIFF, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford.

Church Courts. ROBERT C. NESBITT, M.A., a member of the House of Laity and formerly M.P.

Public Worship in the Church of England: Its Ideals and Problems. The Rev. A. C. BOUQUET, D.D.

Conflicting Ideals in the Church of England. The Rev. L. B. CROSS, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford; Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall.

The Church of England and other Christian Churches. The LORD BISHOP OF ST. EDMUNDSBURY AND IPSWICH.

The Church of England as it might be. The Rev. C. G. CHALLENGER, M.A.

The Modernist's Task in the Church of England. DOUGLAS WHITE, M.A., M.D.

Of course only certain selected aspects of so great a theme could be treated in the Conference programme, but a sincere effort was made to deal as far as possible with the centre rather than with the circumference of the subject and with practical issues rather than with theories.

There is probably no Christian Church harder to understand, especially by those who do not belong to it, than the Church of England. It appears to be composed of contradictions, illogicalities, anomalies, of everything, in short, which is calculated to irritate the logical high-brows and to confuse the simple charcoal-burners.

In this respect it is like the British Constitution or like the University of Oxford. People complain that they have lived all their lives under the British constitution and have not the vaguest notion of its principles. The British citizen claims to be the freest in the world and yet the Sovereign may kill any of his subjects without being prosecuted for murder. It is alleged that visitors to Oxford have complained that they have visited every college in the University city and yet have failed to find the

University. The anomalous character of our British Constitution, like the illusiveness of the University of Oxford, are characteristic of the Church of England, which is one of the most English of our English institutions. Some assert that the Church is only the religious aspect of the State and that every clergyman is a servant of the Crown and every citizen, unless he has renounced his allegiance, a member of the Church. Others assert that the Church exists apart from the State and that it is not only older than the State but superior to it.

Of course to those who do not know, these statements appear to be flat contradictions. But to those who know, they are complementary truths. 'Truth,' said the great Westcott, 'comes through life, not through logic.' The nature of the Church of England — her constitution, character and call — is best realized by those who have lived loyally in her membership and, striving to do their duty as Churchmen and Englishmen, have been satisfied to make the ideal of their lives: 'Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God.'

It is not, however, for such that these Conference papers were primarily written, but rather for those who, living within the Church of England, have not been satisfied to take her for granted but have constantly asked questions about her and have been anxious, not that she should be what she is, but that she should be made to become what she is not.

She has been described as a Church faced with the problem of housing three religions under one roof. This would appear to be her call and is reflected in her character, but whether it be a fundamental of her constitution is much disputed.

Some assert that the Church of England is Catholic, and it is only because she is Catholic that they can conscientiously be members of her. But what they precisely mean by Catholic is hard to discover, for some would seem to identify the term Catholic with Papal or Roman; others with Primitive Christian practice, doctrine and organization.

Then there are those who assert that the Church of England is Protestant and that as soon as she ceases to be Protestant they will have nothing more to do with her. But what they precisely mean by Protestant is hard to discover, for some would seem to identify the term Protestant with Evangelical Funda-

mentalism and Puritanism in Public Worship: others with the refusal to acknowledge that the Bishop of Rome has any lawful authority in England, and that in the interests of spiritual religion many ecclesiastical practices which were rejected at the Reformation ought not to be re-introduced into our national Church. In any case it may be well to observe that the word Protestant does not occur in the authorized formularies of the Church of England.

Others assert that the Church of England cannot justly be described as either Catholic or Protestant. The word Catholic primarily means Universal, and a Church which is only a part of the Universal Church of Christ cannot properly be described as Catholic. The inadequacy of the term Protestant to describe the Church of England is equally manifest. Protestant is primarily a negative term, and protest against Roman error and Roman tyranny is to-day a very small part of the positive duty of the Church of England.

First and foremost the Church of England is a national Church. Her earliest designation in Church History is to be found in the writings of the Venerable Bede—*Ecclesia gentis anglorum*—the Church of the English Nation. It is only because she is national that she can become truly international—one of a world-wide fraternity of national Churches; Christian in their fellowship, ideals and spirit, but national in their organization and administration. Others assert that true internationalism can only be found in the imperialism of the Roman Church: others, that it can only be found in the individualist denominationalism of the Protestant 'Free Churches,' where each man is free to choose for himself his own Church and is free to depart from it when it ceases to please him—a freedom which will seem to others to be a form of ecclesiastical licentiousness.

Besides being national our Church of England is established by the State. This does not mean that the State created her in the days of Henry VIII as is often erroneously affirmed, for the English Church existed long before the English State. At the Reformation the State at last broke the tyranny of the Papacy over the English Church and Nation which it had long sought to check and curb. The State, then acting constitutionally and with the consent of the Church, brought both Church and State

into the closest possible relationship. The object of the State by this union was the welfare of the English nation. Tudor statesmen held themselves to be responsible for the spiritual welfare of their nation as well as for its political freedom and economic prosperity. They did not conceive of the functions of government being limited, as did the Manchester school of politicians, to 'the fattening of men as though they were hogs.'

The Rt. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, Warden of New College, asserts in his brilliant and recently published second volume of *A History of Europe* that the Tudor Reformation gave us 'a national Church Erastian in government, Roman in ritual, Calvinist in theology' (p. 443).

This will seem to many serious students of the Church of England a notable example of the *dictum: Dolus latet in generalibus*. All three generalizations are untrue.

The Church of England is not Erastian. Our English sovereign does not hold the title *summus episcopus*, a title borne by the sovereigns of the Continental Reformed Churches. Although himself a Sacred Person, as the result of his coronation, our sovereign has no authority to minister either the Word or Sacraments in the Church of England, but receives both from her ordained ministers. Neither has he any power to take part in the government of the Church save in such a manner as the Church has already assented to. For practical purposes to-day this co-operation in the government of the Church has devolved upon the Prime Minister, the political representative of the British nation, and this authority can of course only be exercised constitutionally. How strictly limited the Prime Minister's functions and powers are in this matter can best be realized by the serious student of the history of the English Church.

Although the State can disestablish and disendow the Church of England, it cannot dissolve her, for she neither derives her existence from the State nor depends upon the State for her survival; yet without the State's consent she cannot alter her constitution or doctrine. Hence she can no more accurately be described as Erastian than she can be described as Ultramontane.

Neither is the Church of England Roman in her ritual. Our Tudor Reformers in their revisions of the Liturgy were sedulous

to purge out all idolatrous and superstitious practices: all dark and dumb ceremonies. The ritual of the Mass they did all in their power to abolish: they broke down the stone altars in the parish churches: they gave the cup to the laity: they substituted ordinary bread for the consecrated wafer. In the Sacrament of Baptism they abolished many Roman ceremonies and though, in the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI, they retained exorcism, the anointing with the chrism and the investing of infants with the chrysom, they abolished these ceremonies from the Second Prayer Book of that King. The English Reformers' ideal of ritual was New Testament and Primitive Catholic, which they distinguished sharply from Roman.

As for the theology of our English Church, it may truly be described as reformed, and like all Reformation systems of doctrine was influenced by the *Institutes* of Calvin. Nevertheless, our Church doctrine is not characteristically Calvinist.

It was said of the pulpit of the Temple Church occupied every Sunday morning by Richard Hooker, the most learned and judicious exponent of the doctrine of our Tudor Church, and occupied every Sunday afternoon by Thomas Cartwright, his Puritan opponent, that the pulpit 'spake pure Canterbury in the morning and pure Geneva in the afternoon.'

This indicates that although Calvinist teaching and Calvinist preachers existed within the Church of England in Tudor days, that Church was not characteristically or dominantly Calvinist in its doctrine. The 'ever-memorable' John Hales, after he had listened to the disputes of Calvinists and Arminians at the Synod of Dort, 'bade John Calvin goodnight,' and in so doing he only did what the Church of England had done quite definitely at the Hampton Court Conference some years earlier (1604 A.D.).

The two-sided character of our English Church is sufficiently indicated by the belief that John Calvin and a contemporary Pope were both willing to admit the sufficiency of the English Prayer Book. It would be more correct to say that our Tudor Reformation gave us a Church, theocratic in government, Primitive Catholic in ritual, and New Testament in doctrine. But that is far from summing up the situation.

Edmund Burke declared that a striking characteristic of the Church of England was that she was a Church professing falli-

bility. Those who mistakenly identify inspiration with infallibility declare that they have no use for a Church which is not infallible. Such do not realize how much of value is contained in this affirmation of ecclesiastical fallibility in an age where apprehension of the truth is regarded as of necessity progressive and that the possession of new truth renders old truth inadequate and in certain cases defective and erroneous. It is only those who know they are fallible who in this modern scientific age are regarded as either able to learn the truth or as fit to teach it. We have no use either for men or Churches who believe themselves to be infallible. 'I beseech you in the bowels of our Lord Jesus Christ,' said Oliver Cromwell to certain Puritan Divines, 'to conceive it possible that you may be mistaken.'

Because it recognized itself to be fallible the Church of England was also given, by the grace of God, the power of growth and of self-adaptation.

To define the nature of a growing body, possessed of a developing constitution, is a matter of extreme difficulty, because whereunto it may grow has always to be taken into consideration by the definition-makers; and who can say what that growth shall, in the end, prove to be? 'The true nature of a thing,' said Aristotle, 'is that which it is, when its becoming is completed,' and for the Church of England the end is not yet.

Our Church, not the least Christian of the many Churches that claim that august title, yet so generally misunderstood and misrepresented, may yet possess much of Christ's spirit. Of the Founder of the Christian religion it was prophetically declared that He was 'set for the falling and rising up of many in Israel and for a sign which is spoken against' (*Lk.* ii, 34).

If there is any outstanding lesson to be derived from the papers and speeches of the recent Modern Churchmen's Conference at Girton, it is that the Church of England is not like any other of the existing Christian Churches, nor ought it to be conformed to any one of them. Its glory is in being its true self, since thereby it will be able to perform a service for Christendom and for mankind of immense value and which it, only, in the Providence of God can achieve. 'To thine own self be true' ought to be the motto of our Church in this age: and in order to be true to itself a right understanding of itself is needful, and

it is hoped that the papers contained in this number of the *Modern Churchman* will help to this end.

It seemed to us that the three practical and dominant emphases stressed by the Conference were :

(1) First that everything should be done that it is possible to do to secure, not only co-operation but organized unity between the English Church and the other Reformed Communions throughout the British Empire. If, as a consequence of such efforts, closer fraternal relations ensue between the English Church and the orthodox Churches of the East and the Roman Catholic Church, so much the better, but whether these results follow is of secondary and quite minor importance in comparison with reunion between the Church of England and those bodies which have separated from her. It was admitted that such reunion could not and ought not to be based upon any rigorous uniformity in organization and doctrine, but upon a spirit of fellowship and mutual service which finds its inspiration in loyalty to Christ and His Gospel of the Kingdom.

(2) The second emphasis was on the urgent need for doctrinal reform, not in the sense of disavowing or discarding the great essentials of the Christian faith, but in the removal from them of various traditional errors which have become associated with them in a number of cases and have obscured or perverted the essential truth which they were supposed to attest and reflect. In short, as the result of historic and scientific criticism, the removal from the Christian faith of those things which are made that the things which cannot be shaken may remain.

Professor Burkitt asserted, shortly before his death, that nearly every theological student in Cambridge who had the option of Dogmatic Theology or the Philosophy of Religion, chose the latter : for these young men felt concerned to know, not what had been believed but what ought to be believed. When that feeling is abroad, even among theological students, a revision of our traditional theology becomes urgent.

No liturgical reform of first-class value can be accomplished without doctrinal reform. Such a reform would not prohibit traditional Churchmen from holding the Christian faith in combination with erroneous accretions, should they so wish, but it

would mean that modern-minded Churchmen would not only be under no obligation to do so but would be free to hold and affirm nothing except the essentials of the Christian faith and to use a public liturgy which assumed and affirmed neither more nor less.

(3) The third emphasis was upon the extreme importance of maintaining the close existing relation between Church and State. The Christian character and spirit of the English people owes much to that relationship. Without the help of the State the Church could never have reformed herself. Without her relationship to the State the Church's influence on the national life would have been fluctuating and feeble : her contribution to learning and culture incomparably smaller : her comprehensiveness more restricted and rigid : her leaders less distinguished and judicious.

In days when the Christian religion in this land is as vigorously assailed by secularism on the one hand as it is by superstition on the other, anything which would weaken that tested and beneficial relationship between Church and State so profitable to both parties would not only be of deep disservice to the religion and morality of our nation, but might not improbably end in the disestablishment, disendowment, disruption and dissolution of the Church of England itself or else reduce it to the size and significance of the 'Wee Frees.'

THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD

By the Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, D.D., D.Litt., K.C.V.O.

MY first appearance at a Modern Churchmen's Conference in the position of President seems to call for some words on the situation in which I find myself. It is a matter of sincere regret to me that my distinguished predecessor, Dr. Inge, could not be persuaded to continue as President of our Society. There is no need in this assembly to dwell upon the services which he has rendered to our cause. His unflinching intellectual courage was not only an inspiration to us, but exemplified to the world outside the kind of temper for which we stand. Few voices were so widely listened to as his, and perhaps no one in our time has so plainly shown by the convincing argument of personal example that the most unquestionable intellectual honesty can be combined with a deep religious experience. The time has not yet come, happily, to estimate his contribution to our Church and to the religious life of our people, but we may be confident that when that estimate is made it will be found that his influence was among the most potent of our time.

Dr. Inge always insisted that the aim of the Modern Churchmen's Union was not to promote a party in the Church of England and that it would be disastrous if Modernists were simply a third group along with Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals. I venture to express my cordial agreement with this view. It is true, I hope, that among us are representatives of both the great traditions of the English Church. Modernism in the sense in which that word has come to be understood is, I take it, the name of a method rather than of a set of conclusions. To me at least Modernism means a readiness to apply the new knowledge which science and scholarship have supplied in the better understanding of our religion. We do not, as is sometimes alleged against us, erect some entity called 'the Modern Mind' and fall down before it as an idol, nor do we foolishly assume that the mind of the present generation is in possession of infallible truth. Our attitude is more modest and more reason-

able. We try to be ready to welcome any new truth which comes to light, believing that the truth shall make us free and that those who are 'of the truth' will be willing to listen to the revelation which comes to our own generation as well as that which has come to the generations which are past. We believe too that only the truth can make us one. In the long run, we can be united only by agreement on the fundamental truths of our religion, and we shall experience a growing fellowship one with another just in so far as we are all engaged upon the quest for truth.

It may be admitted that, in the past, our membership has been predominantly Liberal Protestant in sympathy, though never exclusively so. The circumstances of theological development no doubt partly account for this fact. Those circumstances have changed, and I can see no reason why we should not in the future include a large number of Liberal Catholics. No one can doubt that the Anglican Church includes many priests and laymen whose traditions of worship and religious life are catholic and who agree with us in their attitude to Biblical criticism and philosophy. It has often been remarked, notably in Mr. Vidler's recent book on the subject, that the Modernist movement in the Roman Church, which has been driven underground in the communion of its birth, has borne its most notable fruit in our own Church. May I express the hope that many more of these Catholic Modernists will join our Society and represent a point of view with which many of us already are in sympathy? The Modern Churchmen's Union is not an organization to promote a special brand of Protestantism, it is a society which exists to further the restatement and the rethinking of our Christian Faith; and in this task we need the aid of all whose minds are open to the reception of new truth.

The subject of our deliberations at this Conference is the Church of England, and it is tempting to proceed with the thread of my discourse by laying before you some thoughts on its present situation. I shall resist this temptation and content myself with saying that, in my opinion, Modernists should above all men be jealous for the comprehensiveness of the Church. We believe in reason and the power of persuasion. We have no desire to exclude from the Church those who do not agree

with us; rather we desire that they should remain within the fellowship, so that we may pursue the truth together by friendly controversy. The Modern Churchman has no use for anathemas.

Perhaps some observations on the question which is a preliminary to our discussions will not be out of place. We shall, in our consideration of the Church of England, presuppose the general idea of the Church. The Church of England is a branch or portion of the Church of God. We cannot wholly avoid the much-debated question of the marks of the true Church.

Our subject has acquired great practical importance in recent years through what may seem to some the accidents of history. I should prefer to say that the Providence of God is forcing us to face the problem of the nature of the Church and its place in the modern world.

In the political sphere the whole conception of the Church has met with a sudden and dangerous challenge. Perhaps a sociologist of great insight might have foreseen the development of the modern totalitarian state, but to most of us the recent events in Europe have come as a surprise. The challenge to the Church is sometimes said to be the result of that strange enhancement of nationalism which is one of the unexpected consequences of the war, and so long as we confine our attention to Germany this may seem a plausible explanation. We must not forget, however, that Russia is the place where the Church has endured the most staggering blows and where the *régime* is explicitly and avowedly hostile to its very existence. Fascism and Naziism may be regarded as a reaction against atheistic Communism, a reaction which unfortunately fights with weapons borrowed from its enemy. The old liberal ideal of the free Church in the free State is almost everywhere in retreat. We must look deeper than the progress of nationalism for the cause of this situation. It lies, I suggest, in the growth of the idea that the State, whether it be national or international, can provide for all the needs of man and that there is no aspect of man's spirit which cannot find its fulfilment in the community of which the State is the instrument. In other words, we are confronted with the situation that a majority of civilized people are more or less persuaded that in this world

only we have hope and that any doctrine which finds man's roots and his final consummation in the unseen and eternal is a delusion.' The Church stands for the possibility of a supernatural life and for the necessity of a vision which goes beyond the confines of this present world; it asserts that the life of the spirit must be nourished from the unseen; in short, it holds to the belief in the Creator God and His revelation in Jesus Christ whose Kingdom is not of this world.

It is a melancholy fact that the Christian Church as a whole, facing one of the most acute crises in its history, should not have drawn from the signs of the times the lesson of the need for a more courageous attempt to secure Christian unity. Surely in the presence of a danger which threatens all organized Christianity we ought to draw more closely together in defence of those values which we hold in common. The weakness of the Church lies in its divisions, and I cannot help thinking that the chief obstacle to reunion is the ignorance of Christians. We find them still engaged in the eager discussion of points which have little or no bearing on the modern predicament; cherishing differences when they should be dwelling upon fundamental agreement, and even excommunicating one another on questions which modern scholarship has already answered or has shown to be unanswerable. We who believe in the necessity of the Church should pray that its members may be given a sense of proportion.

From another standpoint the importance of the Church has recently been brought home to us. Theological development is once more pushing the conception of the Christian community to the forefront. I do not refer merely to the obvious necessity of thinking out again the doctrine of the Church in order to vindicate its position in the modern world, but also to the latest advance in New Testament criticism. The so-called 'Form Criticism' of the Gospels has suggested a means by which we may pass behind the written sources of our canonical Gospels and discover the oral tradition from which they came. The results of this type of research are still very uncertain, and there are great differences of opinion among its exponents. In the opinion of the more extreme scholars, the method leads to a disturbing scepticism about the historical foundation of the

things most certainly believed among us concerning Jesus and His teaching. It is suggested that the stories about the Lord and His words are largely the creation of the primitive Christian community. I am very far from accepting this conclusion, and I believe that it will be found in the end impossible to shake the view that in St. Mark we have substantially the tradition derived from St. Peter; but the Form critics have at least reminded us that the Church has great importance in the earliest years of our religion and that our knowledge of Jesus depends, if not upon its imagination, certainly upon its memory.

These considerations make it difficult to trêat the doctrine of the Church as a secondary element in the Christian faith. I do not think it can be questioned that, in the past, there has been a tendency among Liberal Christians to make a distinction between the original Gospel and the Church. The view has been held that the history of the Church is, on the whole, the story of the obscuring of the pure Gospel, and that we can distil, as it were, the primitive message from the foreign elements with which it has been contaminated. I believe that it is very difficult to defend this type of liberal theology. It is true that the course of scholarship has not been favourable to the old-fashioned school of Liberal Protestantism. For my part at least, I must hold that the Church is a part of the Gospel, and that it is not true to say either that the Gospel creates the Church or that the Church is simply the means by which the Gospel was both transmitted and obscured. Gospel and Church cannot be understood in separation one from the other. At least it seems beyond controversy that in the Pauline version of the Gospel the Church is an integral element.

It may be thought perhaps that modern scholarship has, on the other hand, rendered untenable the view, held by orthodox Catholics and Protestants alike, that the Church was founded by the historical Jesus. Much discussion has turned on the extent to which the New Testament has been affected by eschatological ideas and, in particular, concerning the place of eschatology in the thought and teaching of our Lord. I must not here discuss this large question. It will be sufficient here to say that, in my opinion, the Kingdom of God as proclaimed both by John the Baptist and Jesus had an eschatological sense. I do not mean

that we should accept the conclusions of those extreme eschatologists who would find in the Kingdom as preached by Jesus nothing but ideas which were derived from Apocalyptic sources, and I should hope that we might avoid the reproach directed by my distinguished predecessor against some critics that they represented Jesus as a 'deluded fanatic.' I would agree that we find in the Gospels 'transmuted eschatology,' and I would insist, with Professor Whitehead, that the eschatological form of thought has been the appropriate medium for the apprehension of intuitions of absolute value. But I do not see how it can be maintained that the eschatological outlook was not present in the thought of Jesus. The limitations which the Incarnation implied included that of thinking and teaching in the forms of thought of the day and generation in which it took place. Therefore it seems that we could not reasonably hold that Jesus looked forward to the long history of the Church in the world or that He made detailed provision for its organization. It would be difficult to defend, in the light of modern New Testament scholarship, the thesis that any ecclesiastical order has the authority of the historical Jesus, though we may believe that it has the approval of the risen and ascended Christ.

Must we therefore deny that the Church has any direct connexion with the teaching and work of Jesus? Far from it. There is a manifest continuity between the Apostolic Church and the Apostolic group which gathered round the historical Jesus. The eschatological motif is here not a division but a link. The earliest Church was permeated by the idea of the coming Kingdom, now envisaged as the return of the risen Lord. The Christian Church grows out of the 'little flock' who waited for the consolation of Israel and to whom Jesus declared it was the Father's good pleasure to give the Kingdom.

The Church is, in idea and intention, properly described as a 'supernatural' society. This character belongs to it not only by reason of the events of the Day of Pentecost, but also because of the definitely 'other-worldly' nature of the gospel with which it is associated. I suggest that it is important to preserve the emphasis on the unique character of the Church as a society, while avoiding the illegitimate deductions which have often been drawn from this truth. In the end, I suppose,

everything turns on the interpretation which we give to the Kingdom of God. In the past, some liberal Christians have identified the Kingdom with social righteousness and have found the whole meaning of the Christian message in the 'social gospel.' When the Kingdom is thus interpreted, it is perhaps natural to regard the Church as simply an association of religious idealists who care for human welfare and progress. So far as I can see, there is no ground for any such interpretation in the primitive records of our religion. The Kingdom has only an indirect connexion with civilization and progress. It does not, in the teaching of the New Testament, depend on the efforts of man, but upon the grace of God, and the characteristic note of the earliest Christianity is not that it has discovered a new hope for human society but that it has found God through Jesus Christ. I do not think we can abandon this other-worldly and supernatural reference when we are thinking out again our doctrine of the Church. The Church is, we must hold, the Body of Christ and the special sphere of the action of the Holy Spirit.

But many of the consequences which have been drawn from these truths are false. Though the Church is the providential instrument for the propagation of the Kingdom of God, it is not identical with this Kingdom. The Church may become so corrupt and unenlightened that, in some circumstances, it may be, on the whole, an obstacle to the Kingdom. Though it seems that a Christian belief in the Providence of God must convince us that the Church cannot wholly fail and that it will be renewed from time to time by the Spirit of God, we have no ground for assuming that its doctrines are infallible or unchangeable, nor dare we assert that there can be no new truth, even truth about God, which is not given through her and signed with her manual.

If the general idea of the Church which I have attempted to sketch is true, there can be no doubt that the Church is ideally one. Perhaps there is to-day no need to elaborate this point. The time when enlightened men could regard with a certain complacency our divisions and even argue that competition made for efficiency is past. As I have said, the crisis is too serious for such superficialities. There is a great need for the thinking out of a Modernist conception of the Catholic Church. The press-

ng call for unity of action among Christians is awakening in many minds a new realization of the ideal unity of the Church and an impatience with the sectionalism whether of denomination or nationality which now infects the Christian fellowship. There is before the world an impressive programme of reunion in a Catholic Church, one which proposes a return to the past, a submission to a dogmatic system alleged to be infallibly true, and a repudiation of the work of the Reformation. We must have some alternative proposal which will be no less practicable and more inspiring. I suppose that any Modernist doctrine of the Catholic Church must be determined by our fundamental beliefs about revelation and the spiritual value of freedom. We do not hold that the revelation of God to man is finished, and consequently we cannot be satisfied with a Church which looks only at the past. We cannot agree that there is any body of dogma so much beyond criticism and revision that the mind must conform itself obediently to its pattern. Though we shall regard with reverence the formulas in which the Christian experience of centuries has found expression, we desire that the Church shall be a sphere where men may think freely and where the spirit of prophecy is not quenched. I may add that any Catholic Church of the future must be one in which the varieties of human temperament, and the consequent varieties of religious experience, are frankly recognized. Our purpose must be the maximum of unity with the maximum of diversity, a unity of the spirit which is compatible with the most divergent forms of worship.

No one would contend that such a Catholic Church is easy to achieve or even easy to imagine. There is one fundamental difficulty which specially concerns Modern Churchmen. We are bound together in our society by our common conviction that we must be facing the facts, seeking the truth and having our minds open to new truth and new problems. We contend that the teaching Church is also the learning Church. All this is plausible enough so long as we keep to generalities; but there is a real problem concealed behind them. The Church cannot be merely a society of people interested in religion and engaged in a search for religious truth. It cannot be an organization for theological discussion. If the Church has any mission in the

world it is as a body of people who believe that they have found some truth of the most supreme importance; the mission of the Church is not to seek for a gospel which it may hereafter preach, but to preach a gospel of which it is already possessed.

I do not see how we can solve this problem without encountering the question, What is the essence of Christianity? What is that permanent core of truth and reality which cannot be shaken, though it may be interpreted in different ways for different ages? It would be out of place to discuss here, towards the end of my address, this fundamental question. It is, however, worth while to observe that the situation in which we find ourselves is not unprecedented. We can, in fact, find an analogy in the Apostolic age. During the life-time of St. Paul, the Christian faith was going through a process of rapid development. The mind of the Apostle was grappling with the interpretation of the Christian gospel, its implications and its place in history. There is no doubt that much of his thought was scarcely comprehended by the mass of Christians, nor is there any doubt that his own mind moved on to new positions as his experience grew. Nevertheless the gospel which he preached was not his own interpretation of the message, but the proclamation common to all the apostles summed up in the earliest creed, 'Jesus is Lord,' Lord of human life now and the Lord of the future. We may learn from the beginnings of the Church the policy for its modern struggle. Our bond of union and our common gospel is that in the life and words and in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ we have not only an example of heroic human goodness, but the act of God revealing Himself to men as nowhere else and intervening in history for the salvation of those who believe. No doubt this statement is full of theology, no doubt almost every word in it needs explanation, and is moreover capable of many different explanations. In my own opinion, it contains the germ of the theology of the Nicene Creed; but my contention is that our common faith is not primarily a series of theological propositions but the affirmation, based upon religious experience, that God was in Christ reconciling the world.

In conclusion, I wish to express again my conviction that liberal theology must think more earnestly about the doctrine of

he Church if it is to fulfil its mission to reinterpret the Christian aith to the modern world. The New Testament knows noth-ng of a solitary Christian, of one who is not a member of the isible fellowship which has accepted the 'good news of the race of God.' The New Testament, again, knows nothing of a Church which has become merged in the State or dependent upon it. In the past it may have been possible to hope that the ecular community would be so permeated by Christian ideals hat State and Church could appear as two aspects of the same ntity. Events have shattered that dream, and we can now see hat the conflict against Caesarism in all its forms, with which Church history opens, will be repeated in this later age. We see lready in more than one part of the world the Christian Church s the chief bulwark of spiritual freedom. But it stands for a nore precious possession than freedom; fundamentally the onflict is whether human life shall be based upon belief in God r belief in man, and whether man's life is rounded by this resent world or, on the contrary, finds its meaning and its highest ood in God. In this momentous struggle the position of liberal Churchmen will not be easy. An organization which is fighting or its right to exist does not welcome the proposal to re-examine ts creed. It prefers to postpone such arduous labours until he crisis is over, and those who ask questions in the midst of a attle are apt to be regarded as lunatics, or at least as intoler-ble nuisances. We may console ourselves with two reflections. First, that this warfare which is now breaking out will be won not y carnal but by spiritual weapons. The Christian Church will indicate itself by showing that it has the secret of fostering the ighest kind of human life and that it has a deeper truth than ts opponents. It will conquer, if the phrase may be allowed, y out-living and out-thinking its adversaries. In the last resort, he Christian Church will survive, not because of clever propa-anda or subtle policy, but by reason of the quality of its life nd its thought. And secondly, we may say that the nature of he crisis gives us a special call to action and perhaps also a ight to be heard. If the issue is nothing less than belief in God, is clear that the modern situation demands a new emphasis pon the belief in a God who is living. The development of cience and philosophy is all in the direction of dynamic con-

cepts. We cannot be satisfied with a doctrine of God which represents Him as a synthesis of static abstractions. Our religious and our intellectual needs demand a God who is unceasingly creative, manifesting Himself in history and in the souls of men. We believe that He spoke in times past through the prophets and supremely through His Son, but we believe that He is speaking to us now if we have the courage and insight to apprehend. In this faith we may be confident not only that the Church of the Living God cannot finally fail, but also that through crisis and conflict it will come to a deeper knowledge of the truth.

THE DOCTRINAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt., author of *The Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England, The Gospel of Modernism,* etc.

IT is a living organism — this Church of England that we have to do with; a spirit-bearing body fashioning its own life; not patient of being fashioned, or re-fashioned, or even of being interpreted, according to a model. To read its doctrinal characteristics is like reading the principles which govern a complex and growing personal character; it has all the fascination and difficulty of a human study: antecedents, environment, and individuality all needing to be taken into account. Some there are, I am well aware, who read the doctrinal characteristics of the Church of England as others read the political theory of the English Constitution — easily. It is possible to propound theories of belief in the light of the distinguishing dogmas of a Church party; to follow these dogmas during their time of periodical occultation, and then see them as the ruling thoughts of the Mother of our souls. But this is, more or less, to separate religion from humanity; to view it intellectually and abstractedly as a constellation of celestial truths; whereas, if religion is the heart of life, it must have intimate relationship to history, and to history as a whole. As Mark Pattison wrote: 'Both the Church and the World are what they are as the result of the whole of their antecedents.' Therefore, to propound a true theory of belief of the Church of England — much more, an authoritative system of dogma — it is necessary to consider, with the insight that belongs to living studies, the course of theological thought within that Communion from the earliest days, but especially from the Reformation onwards.

To-day we may barely glance at the times before the Reformation; but if what I have already said is true, we must not expect to find that at the Reformation the Church of England either — merely — 'washed its face,' or — radically — transferred its existence to an entirely new basis of doctrine and

discipline. In the one case it would have remained distinctively Roman, which it is not. As for the other, its life was too rich, its influence too varied, its relations too complex — touching the national existence in all its multiple expressions at too many points — to be capable of being reduced to any new and definite shape in supposed uniformity with the model of Scripture, or the simplicity of the primitive Church; 'the new must grow out of the old,' as Principal Tulloch said, 'and fit itself into the old.' So the Spirit of God came upon this Church in England and it experienced a re-birth. Then it burst the restraints that were upon it; threw off excrescences of belief and practice; sent out new shoots which instinctively groped their way towards survival, though not all were powerful to survive. No theory can adequately encompass these manifestations of fresh life in all their richness and profusion; yet if we will be taught, we may, as we look back to-day, nevertheless find them amenable to the interpretation of thought.

One theory of the English Reformation is still so vigorously propagated as to need refutation — the theory that our Church arose from King Henry VIII's desire for a divorce (a divorce, or annulment, of the kind, be it not forgotten, that was in those times granted daily), and from the Pope's refusal of it in this instance. Incidentally, those who think they thus revile the Church of England as then by law established seem to overlook the part played by the Emperor Constantine when he established Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire. And if both rulers acted scandalously as husbands, Henry was at least a good father, and he was not baptized by a professed Arian. To ascribe the English Reformation to Henry's desire for a divorce is, however, false. This accounted only for the severance of English national Christianity from the Papacy; and even this was in accord with the wishes of the English people, reflecting their innate independence and often-expressed rebellion against Papal authority. The real part played in the history of Anglicanism by Henry's break with Rome was that it proved a fortunate circumstance for the steady progress of a religious Reformation begun with the fourteenth century mystics and eagerly desired by many since John Wiclif's time. On the Continent, the need and desire for religious reform led, itself, directly to

a break with both Pope and Emperor, so that the Continental Reformation was inextricably mingled with quarrels and bloodshed which disturbed and distorted its natural progress. In England, on the other hand, the break with Rome having already taken place on the independent grounds of Henry's divorce, the Reformation, a *religious* movement, pursued a natural and gradual course as the outcome of sound learning and of zeal for the type of Christian life disclosed by a fresh study of the New Testament.

If I were preaching a sermon on the theme appointed me I should take for my text, 'He that doeth the will shall know of the doctrine.' As I read history, the English Reformers had their minds fixed upon a religious and moral reformation. That this endeavour brought them also to some changes of doctrine was due to the discovery of new aspects of Truth in their time. Their changes of doctrine were in that sense accidental and contingent.

That their reform was primarily practical was due, I think, to four causes.

The first was the natural temperament of the English people, which ever tends to lay stress on doing and on the thing done. Systematic thought, which is always the activity of the relatively few, tends in England more than elsewhere to lag behind action. But it is comforting to find that our Lord regarded action as the characteristic expression of religion. 'What shall I *do* to inherit eternal life?' was a question He approved of.

Secondly, the Church in England shared in the general awakening of an intense spirit of nationality; and therefore was necessarily conceived to include *all* in this country who professed and called themselves Christians. Inevitably, it was bound to have regard to the spiritual progress of its varied members in their several states and stages rather than to speculative doctrines.

Thirdly, the birth of the English Reformation was not in any *one* great soul. The conversion-throes of a Luther, still less the Scholastic subtleties of a Calvin, have not stamped their impress on it. It was the outcome, in the educated section of the nation, of earnest study not only of the Scriptures but also of

Christian antiquity. And therein, Origen, Tertullian, Ambrose, Cyprian, Theodoret, Chrysostom, Basil, Eusebius, Jerome, and Dionysius all received as much attention as Augustine. There is in this a significance of which Dr. Foakes-Jackson first made me aware. The almost exclusive attraction of Augustine is for the twice-born; and with catastrophic conversion goes a primary stress on doctrine — the doctrine of Justification by Faith in some form. But the study of the other Fathers, and particularly of those Biblical scholars Origen and Jerome, quickens an interest in Christian origins and so issues not in revolution but in purification — in zeal for the reform of later distortions and abuses.

Fourthly, the English Reformation grew in part out of the life of the people, those who, as Ben Sirach says, 'maintain the fabric of the world' but are not 'filled with the spirit of understanding.' There was in its time a marked revival of religion amongst the tradesmen of the Metropolis; also amongst the peasantry, for instance, the so-called 'just men' of Lincolnshire. 'Some of the stories preserved by Foxe' — I am now quoting Tulloch — 'show a proud and bitter cynicism naturally bred by the circumstances of these humble people and by the stern repression of all earnest feeling awakened in them.' As a man of the name of John Brown, so we read, was descending the Thames in a passage-boat to Gravesend, he fell into conversation with a priest, who insolently admonished him that he stood too near his sacred person. 'Do you know who I am?' demanded the priest. 'No, sir,' said Brown. 'Well, then, you must know that I am a priest.' 'Indeed, sir!' said Brown; 'and pray, are you a parson, or vicar, or lady's chaplain?' 'No, I am a soul priest; I sing masses for souls.' 'Do you, sir?' remarked Brown, 'and can you tell me where you find the soul when you begin mass and where you leave it when the mass is ended?' 'Thou art a heretic,' said the priest, 'and I will be even with thee.' And the man was actually denounced to the Archbishop and burnt at the stake — a story which is minutely and movingly told by Foxe, and repeated by D'Aubigné. Then again, amid the fens of Lincolnshire, we are introduced to a peasant threshing his corn in his barn as a neighbour passes by and salutes him cheerfully. 'Good-morrow! you are hard at work.' 'Yes,'

eplied the man, in allusion to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, 'I am threshing God Almighty out of the straw.' Significantly, the two practices revealed by these extracts to have been epugnant even to the common mind, namely, prayers for the lead and the elevation of the Host — and the doctrines which upheld them — were the only things in pre-Reformation religion which the Church of England completely and clearly repudiated. And for this repudiation, an innate feeling for what is real, in he common acceptance of this term, combined with moral indignation at the sale of Indulgences, was chiefly responsible.

The *rationale* of the English Reformation was not, then, ully grasped by those who took part in it. As Canon Streeter ays, they 'blundered unconsciously into a revolution in theological thinking,' only the method of it being disclosed to them. The spirit of the age came upon them, and through it they heard he voice of the Spirit of the Ages; but being Englishmen their peculative reason hardly stirred, only their practical reason, in passionate sense of contrast between the simplicity of religion n Apostolic times, as recently disclosed to them, and the Christianity of the Papacy, overweighted with Canon Law, Indulgences and Dispensations, with the Mass and Ecclesiastical Ceremonies. The flame thus kindled in the moral reason spread o the devotional, the lyrical and the dramatic faculties of many Englishmen; as witnessed by the English versions of the Bible, he Book of Common Prayer, the Private Prayers of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the poems of the Elizabethan lyricists and by he works of Shakespeare. The rebirth of genuine religion is lways succeeded by a flowering of humanity. 'Religion in its ompleteness,' said Dr. Westcott, 'is a harmony of philosophy, thics, and art, blended into one by spiritual force, by a conception at once personal and absolute.' Each of these elements as present in the English Reformation, save one — the philoophical. In all the sixty years after the breach with Rome, and hen only at the end of them, there arose but one true philosopher nd theologian, Richard Hooker. The impulses which moved ur countrymen were too many and diverse for any synthesis to e possible to them, let alone acceptable when it came. Theology was in that fruitful, if not ultimately satisfactory, stage hen it must be regarded as a divine life rather than a divine

knowledge. The two are not incompatible; rather is each an element of the whole, heart and mind together being required to make a theologian; but in diverse times and places now the one predominates, and now the other. It is as expressions of a Divine Life only that we should read the varied efforts of our great religious in the plastic, creative hour of the Reformation. Indeed, when I first seriously asked myself, 'What are the doctrinal characteristics of the Church of England?' I exclaimed, 'What are the doctrinal characteristics of the Bible?' The parallel is not fanciful. The simplest and truest view of the Bible is to regard it as manifestations of the Divine Life in a great number of people, according to the gifts which God, through nature, has bestowed upon them. Its library of books is inspired by one Spirit; but what various expressions that Spirit has found! And as the books of the New Testament stand for different types of Christianity, so do the writings of the Reformers and their greatest successors.

The chief names that represent the earliest phase of our Reformation were Tyndale, Bilney and Frith. All these were scholars, as well as martyrs. Frith was 'an exquisite learned man,' says Foxe. Bilney continued something of the spiritual idealism of Colet. Tyndale's influence, through his partial translation of the Bible, was the greatest, and the most revealing of the new spirit that moved in England. From his Bible all ecclesiastical terms are banished; the word 'Church' is set aside in favour of 'congregation,' 'priest' is replaced by 'senior,' 'charity' by 'love'; while in the margins is a running commentary exposing Papal and clerical claims. Of his translation of Jonah, St. Thomas More wrote bitterly:

> 'Jonas made out by Tyndale — a book that whoso delyte therein shall stand in peril that Jonas were never so swallowed by the whale as by the delyte of that booke a mannes soul may be so swallowed up by the Devyl that he shall never have the grace to get out again.'

It was not that More and many others did not wish for a Bible in the language of the people; but they insisted that it must be made by those whom they regarded as loyal Churchmen, and under Church authority; whereas Tyndale looked mainly to the Greek text of Erasmus, and with a single mind. He had no

ignoble fear. Some, there were, whom Bishop Fisher reported as exclaiming, 'O Heavens! O Earth! Erasmus has corrected the Gospels!' But in those 'corrections' lay for him the charter of freedom in reverence to truth.

Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer are the outstanding names of the second and main period of the English Reformation — all these again martyrs and scholars. Ridley's mind was elevated and serene, and his type most representative of that of the Renaissance scholars. Latimer was the most popular in mind and fiery in appeal, but he was wise and moderate in action. When, for example, he found that popular feeling would not brook the discontinuance of dispensing holy bread and water, he prepared explanations of the customs which drew out from them Christian lessons and instructed his clergy to give these lessons at the same time as they gave the symbols. In this way practical Christian impulse slowly undermined old superstitions; and it was a surer way than the delivering of doctrinal and dogmatic attacks upon them. At the same time, it would be quite untrue to suppose that the English Reformers had no intellectual interest in dogma. Indeed, of this interest we may take Cranmer as example. He has left the greatest impress on the English Reformation, and if this is due to his foresight, his liturgical genius and mastery of religious style, it is also due to his steering of the ship through the whirlpools of current theological speculation. He was the friend of many of the Continental Reformers, both Lutheran and Calvinistic, and the nephew, by marriage, of Osiander. Refugees who were trained dogmatic theologians sat at his table and shared his inmost thoughts; and the Thirteen Articles which provide the actual link between the Confession of Augsburg and the Forty-Two Articles were drawn up by Cranmer during the visit of the German Embassy to England in 1538 and 1539.

Yet Cranmer's theology cannot be bracketed entirely with either Lutheranism or Calvinism. In his phraseology about the Eucharist he clung to some of the materialistic language of the Fathers; though he also said that Christ is present in His Sacraments as He is present in His Word, and in no other sense. These two points of view he reconciled on the ground that it is right to speak of the sacraments in the light of what they signify.

Here we see the influence of Platonism, if not directly, then indirectly, through Origen. To the Platonist the connection between type and antitype is always most real.

Again, Cranmer was Erastian in submitting his doctrinal position to King Henry, 'remitting the judgment thereof wholly unto your Majesty,' as he said. And whereas this sentence might have been inspired by Henry's unusual competence in theology, Cranmer went a good deal further. The Prince or the people, he maintained, might make a priest for themselves, for whom no consecration was necessary. And one of the questions which Strype says that he propounded was: Who came first in the New Testament, the bishop or the priest? And if the priest, who made the bishop? Yet he held that Orders are generally necessary; he accepted consecration as a bishop; and himself both consecrated and ordained. These were rational, if not vital, ceremonies.

Observe too the handling of the then burning question of predestination in Article XVII — for there is no doubt, I think, that like the majority of the Articles it comes from Cranmer. It handles the matter in a quite un-Continental style, and halts at making a final pronouncement on the subject. 'Sir,' we remember that Dr. Johnson said, 'predestination was part of the clamour of the times, so it is mentioned in our Articles, but with as little positiveness as could be.' This would perhaps hardly be respectable if a clear pronouncement could be made on such a theme; but since it cannot, what we have to note once again is the Anglican supplantation of dogmatism by explanation and reasoning. Where these cannot reach, the matter is left open, and where they can reach they are used primarily to encourage Godliness; as Article XVII itself says, to draw up the 'mind to heavenly things' and 'fervently kindle the love of God.'

It would be too long a matter to consider in any detail the Thirty-Nine Articles; and I did so in a paper to a previous Conference when my subject was more limited. But for our present purpose I must repeat this much: that there are medievalisms in the Articles is true, but to be expected; the striking thing about them is their combination of these with things quite new. They present us with what, to the Church of England at the time, seemed to be a fair Scriptural account of

the leading doctrines of Christianity; and also with a condemnation of what were held by men like Cranmer to be the principal errors of the Church of Rome and of certain Protestant sects. Yet there is more significance in them than this, for they throw doctrine back upon a Scriptural basis; they maintain that one part of Scripture must not be expounded so as to be repugnant to another; they uphold the right of the Church to decree in matters of faith: and they assert that Churches have erred, and can err, in these matters. Thus, there is no finality of doctrine in them; interpreted in the large way, in the true significance of their combination of opposites, they give us only *direction*. The faces of the Reformers were set towards the future, where lies the destiny of man. And if it be counted a defect in the Reformers that they had no systematic theology, at least they were nearer to a true one than their scholastic predecessors, whose system was abstractedly intellectual and who could relegate a philosophical truth to a special sphere if it conflicted with some accepted theological doctrine. It is often forgotten that even if the insufficiency of the human mind to fathom all mysteries be an argument for leaving mysteries unprobed, it cannot be an argument for making one statement about them rather than another. On the Reformers had dawned a new vision of the unity of Truth, of the old with the new, and of reason with fact. They saw that there is no true distinction between philosophy and theology, for theology is philosophy applied to the subjects of religious belief. The difference lies between theology and religion; and this they saw too.

Thus it is to the Book of Common Prayer that we must look for the genuine expression of our Church's faith. That the Articles are bound together with a manual of worship is in itself a fact of great significance. The *lex credendi* of the Church of England is its *lex orandi*. To understand the meaning of Anglicanism one must know and live the deep religious life that obedience to the Prayer Book fosters. To grasp what are its fundamental doctrines one must realize that they are those alone, even if they are based on history, that the soul knows to be true when it comes into the presence of God; and they are indoctrinated by unconfusing simple types of worship which bring them close to the full and rational life of man.

What are these truths which the Church of England teaches as essential? The greatest of them she holds in common with all other Christian Communions; but let it be noted that the process of their formulation was, from the beginning, and in the Early Church, that which is also most natural to the English mind; that is, a process of moving from experience and history to intellectual formulation, and not *vice versa*. Religion knows nothing of abstractions. There is for religion no Love, or Power, or Goodness, apart from loving, strong, and good persons; we know these qualities in their manifestations, and their essence is inseparable from their action. Thus Christians were forced into a Trinitarian position originally by their need to give some intellectual expression to their experience of God in Jesus.

There is accordingly an extraordinary insistence in the English Prayer-Book upon the Doctrine of the Triune God; and the relation of this to Christian worship arises partly from the impossibility of dissociating the Divine Being from the intimate revelation of Him made to us by Jesus, and partly from the conviction that His Spirit is at work in ours and that ours lives in Him. There is a particular emphasis on the Trinitarian Doxology in the characteristic Anglican Services of Matins and Evensong. It occurs at the beginning of each; it is the refrain of every psalm and of all the Canticles save one — the Te Deum, which, however, has the Trinity for its theme; and it is the formula of the final Blessing. This constant recurrence combines with the use of the vernacular for its recitation to give the doctrine of the Trinity a peculiar value for English devotion. We may note too that this doctrine appealed to Englishmen as the charter of human freedom. As the late Professor A. V. G. Allen said: 'It brings freedom by the proclamation of the co-equality of the Son with the Father, since Christ therefore is placed above kings . . . So long as kings acknowledge Christ as their head and master, the process must be toward emancipation of peoples from every form of bondage.'

But there were other forms which hampered the intellect and the conscience, and prevented men from entering into the full possession of their inheritance; and one of these was an ancient error which obscured the Lordship of Christ, and tended to make His presence and power inoperative by ascribing supreme

titles to His mother. One thinks of Lippo Lippi's fresco on the ceiling of the Cathedral of Spoleto, where in the highest heaven is represented a trinity of Father, Virgin Mother and a golden orb emblematic of the Logos. The Anglican Church dropped all forms of devotional address to the Blessed Virgin, and set forth the doctrine of the Incarnation anew by eliminating the expression 'Mother of God' from Article II, which otherwise closely follows the wording of the Council of Chalcedon. Anglican Trinitarianism is, in its practical devotional emphasis, really new Testament Trinitarianism.

The doctrine of the Trinity indeed contains — if I may use words which I have stored in memory from a lesson I received from Dr. Major — 'profound spiritual, even metaphysical values — pools where lambs may drink and elephants may swim. The doctrine of a Divine Being transcendent, immanent, incarnate, the God of nature, of history and of the rational, moral and spiritual consciousness in man, is by its means preserved in popular form. Its seemingly half-contradictory affirmations maintain a practical balance which other doctrines of God fail to secure.' Thus, the doctrine of the Trinity, as set forth by the Prayer Book, is a tenet characteristic of the Church of England as opposed to Reformation types of Unitarianism; as opposed too, in some respects, to Catholicism.

The Anglican proportion of the doctrine of God is matched by its doctrine of Man, similarly rooted in fact and reason. As opposed to Calvinism, the general tenour of Anglicanism is to stress man's potential spirituality. For example, Christ is said in the Catechism to have redeemed 'me and all mankind'; and the General Thanksgiving is for 'the redemption of the world.' Our Church lays increased stress on human duty by the insertion of the Commandments in the Communion Service; and free-will, by God's grace, to perform that duty is not denied to any man by Article X.

The doctrinal tenet of the Church of England by which it differs characteristically from Lutheranism is that of the Church. Our form of Church government since the Reformation may be, in fact has been, largely congregational in practice; yet Anglicans have always held a high view of the Church as a Divine Society, the Body or the Bride of Christ, in whose fellowship

the Holy Spirit is most readily invoked, awaited and obeyed. In Nowell's Catechism, set forth by the authority of Convocation in 1563, belief in the Church, visible as well as invisible, is set forth plainly as 'The Fourth Part of the Creed,' the other three parts being belief in Father, Son and Holy Spirit. In this catechism the historic 'notes' of the Church are retained, but are set forth with a fresh significance. The Church is Holy, as nourishing saints; it is Apostolic, in the twofold sense of following in the wake of the disciples who first spread the Christian faith and of accepting the task of evangelization. It is One, and Catholic, because it 'containeth and compriseth the universal number of the faithful, that have lived and shall live in all ages and places since the beginning of the world.' Here, a new view of Grace, and of the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the world, is implied. At the same time the Church of England glories in a strongly institutional and sacerdotal aspect. The descent of its ministers from the ancient catholic hierarchy is proudly traced, its discipline and sacramental system exalted. Its saints' days are also the red-letter days of the pre-Reformation Church; and their retention is part of a general leaning to the Catholic habit of keeping times and seasons and of performing small acts and enjoining small sacrifices which open the heart to the Presence and the Voice of God.

That these positive beliefs concerning God, Man, and the Church should emerge as the distinguishing doctrines of a religious society whose general attitude to theology is absence of finality is of the utmost significance. And why? Because, together with Immortality (which belief both is taken for granted and was held in the same form at this time by all Churches), they are the *fundamental* beliefs of Christianity. Though all else change, these may not change and Christianity still be deserving of the name historic. Undoubtedly, our Reformers considered that many other beliefs would not change, including, for example, the Resurrection of the Flesh; but the fact remains that they left the way open for all necessary revision by their grounding of belief in Scripture, by their insistence that Scripture should increasingly be studied, and by their recognition of the principle of development in appealing to the ancient Fathers of the Church as well as to the Prophets, Apostles and Evangelists.

The lack of *a priori* finality in doctrine, which thus seems to be characteristic of the Church of England, raises the important question of religious authority. That is the ultimate question in religion. All forms of Christianity, all religions, would claim that their authority is from God; but by what means is the revelation of His Will made known? If there is no new view of revelation implicit, if not explicit, in the Anglican position, then it possesses no doctrinal characteristics of any real significance. Apart from fundamentals — and they are not many — a few beliefs more or less do not in themselves matter much. We remind ourselves first, then, that the English Reformation began in a rational religious spirit. If it accepted the authority of the Bible, yet at the bidding of the outraged moral consciousness, and in vehement reaction against paganism, the Church of England rejected the superstructure of doctrine built upon three texts: 'Thou art Peter'; 'This is my Body'; 'Hail Mary, full of grace.' An even more active display of rational thoughtfulness was evinced in practical questions of ecclesiastical order. When challenged, 'By what authority doest thou these things?' it answered, for example through Bishop Jewel, that it took its stand for faith and order on the Bible and on the Fathers. To this, Cole and Harding, the Roman Catholic apologists, answered that their beliefs also were in conformity with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles given in Scripture, and in obedience to the Holy Spirit of Truth who guides the Church into all truth; that they were natural developments from the texts I have just quoted and that precedents could be cited from the Fathers in justification of those particular Roman Catholic developments. Jewel's reply was that these were not reasonable developments, but unwarrantable human inventions. In other words, his real argument, without his being actually aware of it, passed outside the spheres of the Bible and of history to that of the principles of Reason. The controversy, since it was not pursued in that region, was therefore inconclusive. But Hooker, who at the close of the sixteenth century looked back and considered what had happened before him, deliberately carried the controversies of the Reformation period into the region of rational light, and drew out from them the principles of authority on which a theology could be constructed.

Himself prophet, priest, and pastor, not less than philosopher, he was able to gather up the various strands present in the English Reformation and weave them into a representative Anglican apologia in his 'Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity,' whose governing idea is that of the unity and all-embracing nature of Law, which dominates the universe as the outward expression of the Government of God and is ever identical with calm and temperate Reason. But, added Hooker, this divine law which is revealed in the rational constitution of human nature is also self-evidently revealed in Holy Scripture. Thus, while he criticized and magnificently defended on rational grounds the Catholic and ecclesiastical developments of the Church of England, those aspects of its faith and order which were plainly to be recognized in Scripture passed without either his investigation or defence. This of course is because in his day no one questioned the divine origin of the Bible, his own great work shaping itself under the single stress of conflict with the Puritans over matters for which direct precedents could not be found in Scripture. His view of authority is summed up best in his own words: 'What Scripture doth plainly deliver, to that the first place both of credit and obedience is due; the next whereunto is whatsoever any man can necessarily conclude by force of Reason: after these the voice of the Church succeedeth.' Such a synthesis as this was, of course, the highest that was possible in an age when the authority of the Church was the only authority that had broken down, never again to be rehabilitated save as fallible and in so far as justifiable at the bar of Reason. The rise of Biblical criticism and the consequent breakdown of Scriptural infallibility was a necessity before Hooker's argument could be followed withersoever it really leads, namely, to the undivided supremacy of Reason as the only source of revelation and authority. Authority must reside in the Church, *or* in the Bible, *or* in Reason. Hooker saw this, and therefore in the last resort he really fell back on the Bible. Nevertheless, his work remains an enduring monument to the rational spirit which we have now seen in many ways to be the motivating power behind the complex forces of the English Reformation. It marks the theological *direction* of that great and distinctive movement.

For all the influence, however, which Hooker had upon the

Puritan malcontents, he might never have been born. They continued, in their unbending attitude, to form a separate party within the Church; and soon, in reaction to them, arose the party ultimately known as the Laudians, who sought to master them by reviving Church authority, and enforcing it at the point of the sword — with the result that there was an increase of Romanism on the one hand, and, on the other, civil war in addition to religious discord. Henceforward, the unity of the Church of England was broken; its history became the history of Church parties, and if we would trace the process by which the Anglican basis of authority was made gradually clearer, and finally explicit, it is to the history of these parties that we must look for the next three hundred years.

The Laudians contributed nothing to this, but among them arose a liberal wing, the first school of Latitudinarians, the school of Lord Falkland, excellent Churchmen but also typical Englishmen of refinement, culture and devout feeling, to whom the discord of the times was a source of pain and scandal, and who sought a more excellent way to order and comprehensiveness in the Church. Reason was strong in these men, so that instead of the prelatical episcopacy demanded by Laud they advocated a constitutional episcopacy as the right form of Church government. One other important contribution they made too in the sphere of doctrine. John Hales, the earliest of their number, tells us how, as early as 1618, when he attended the Synod of Dort, he 'bid John Calvin goodnight'; that is, he and his friends came under the influence of Arminianism, a Continental moral and rational revolt against the doctrine of the complete depravity of human nature, and therefore congenial to genuine Anglicanism. This new tendency, which spread to England, found its outlet in a better grammatical and historical exegesis of the Bible than had previously obtained in Protestantism; and it enunciated as the most 'solvent' of its principles the distinction between fundamental and secondary truths: a distinction plainly based on Reason. It has recently been demonstrated by two Anglo-Catholic scholars,[1] with a gratification that is significant and augurs well for a new harmony in the Church to-day, that Chillingworth, another member of the Falkland school, in maintaining that 'the Bible and the Bible only is the

[1] *Anglicanism*, by P. E. More and F. L. Cross.

religion of Protestants,' was really but affirming his faith in one fundamental doctrine, namely, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. But these early seventeenth century rationalists were *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*: their rational and tolerant attitude in matters of dogma was uncongenial to an over-confidently dogmatic age.

With the Restoration of King Charles II, Anglo-Catholic theology entered on its golden age. From men like Beveridge, Bull and Cosin, we hear once more the clarion call of Church authority; though this time, significantly, not upheld by the sword, but swelled out with learning — with a massive knowledge of patristics. The two modern apologists already mentioned, Dr. Paul Elmer More and Dr. F. L. Cross, bring out the hatred, in their learned forbears, of infallibility in all its manifestations, and their stress upon the doctrine of the Incarnation; and this interpretation of them also, we Modernists welcome. But for the purpose of studying the doctrinal characteristics of the Church of England what we chiefly have to note about the Caroline divines is that through the Fathers they indirectly brought into Anglicanism deeper draughts of Platonism — that philosophy based upon a conviction that the real can be known, and by means of which alone an adequate theology can be constructed. We cannot aver, like Dr. Paul Elmer More, that the main stream of doctrinal evolution passed through the Caroline divines and the Nonjurors, leaving all other schools of thought aside, until it burst out again in the Tractarians: for these last raised once again the stark cry of Church authority; but we recognize the Platonic element in historic Anglo-Catholicism, and believe that if Anglo-Catholics are faithful to it a new theology can be constructed to-day in which all thoughtful Englishmen, to whatever school they belong by temperament, can be at one.

But it is time to take up the other line of thought in the Church of England, and to study its contributions to the clarifying of this ultimate question of authority. The Puritans claimed for their religious authority the Bible, and the Bible only. But they confused the words of Scripture with the inward effect of them upon their souls; and this effect was so mighty, and their response so absolute in respect of the great words of

Scripture, that they attached a similar importance to its lesser words too. It was, again, the authority of their own spirits on which they really rested; and this is the essence of Protestantism. In the age of Cromwell, private judgment ran riot in individual theological dogmatism; but we must not overlook the witness that it bore to man's need to soar to the knowledge of God. Men *must* have a theology. There is a point beyond which we simply cannot agree to differ. But intolerance, and a mood of hyper-orthodoxical sensitiveness brought the inner light into discredit as the supreme authority in religion; the discord and dissension which it created proved that the problem of authority was not solved yet.

Then, from the Puritan party in the Church arose the Cambridge Platonists, just as the Falkland school had arisen from the Laudians. These also were in the direct line of Hooker; but whereas Hooker was more of a systematic theologian, and the Falkland school were rational-minded English Churchmen, the Cambridge Platonists were mystical philosophers. They strove to bring Christianity back to 'her old-loving nurse, the Platonick Philosophy'; and therefore they deliberately extolled Reason as the ultimate vehicle of inspiration, bringing not the Church only but also the Bible into subjection to it. So the new view of Revelation implied in Anglicanism from the beginning became for a time fully explicit. As Professor Creed and Mr. Boys-Smith have said in their Introduction to their *Religious Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, they 'ignored the boundaries between rational and revealed theology. The light of Reason was to flood the whole sphere of religious faith.' But Reason they explained to be, not the discursive understanding, but 'the breath of a higher, diviner Reason'; or, again, 'a beam of divine light.' These last words, indeed, smack more of Plotinism than of Platonism; but their authors did not know the difference between the two. Hence a theosophical, thaumaturgical, and fantastical element marred their writings, especially those of Henry More. But we must remember that in their day criticism of all kinds was in its infancy; few canons of judgment existed. Yet it was also Henry More who said, 'No Spirit, no God'; and by Spirit he meant the Divine in man. As Tulloch, the Scottish philosophical theologian of last cen-

tury — to whose work I owe much in this lecture — says: 'It is impossible to advance the basis of proof for the being of God beyond this, or to rest it anywhere else. The divine Reason is an intuition of the human Reason; or, conversely, the human is an index of the Divine, verifying its object by its own light, and revealing in the very depth of its rationality that the sphere of Spirit transcends and encompasses sense.' That 'matter' is spiritual and human Reason, therefore, the very throne of the Godhead is the very first step in the modern argument for Theism. By the purity of their hearts and lives our Cambridge Philosophers saw this from afar; but, in the seventeenth century, how could these things be? What trustworthy evidence could be adduced, for example, to their materialistic contemporary, Thomas Hobbes? The witness of Natural Science was required, with its evidence for the gradual unfolding of the spiritual within the material by means of the evolutionary process, to place their speculations on unassailable grounds. Again, the development of Biblical criticism was necessary before the last shades of Biblical infallibility could be dispelled, and a new view of Revelation therefore stand the slightest chance of general acceptance. The tenets of the Cambridge Platonists were but a rope of sand to bind English Churchmen together in an age so unscientific. But the march of events in the eighteenth century discloses to our backward glance a real continuity in the progress of Anglican religious thought; for it was now sought to rest authority in the lower reason, the faculty that argues. When this had reduced religion to morality, first Evangelicalism and then Tractarianism attempted once more to revive the old authorities of the Inner Light and of the Church. Broad Churchism followed with its rational acceptance of new knowledge in every department of science. But in Liberal Evangelicalism, Liberal Catholicism and through the leaven of Modernism in both, these parties have drawn nearer together, each having taken something from the other. A true philosophical theology is in sight which displays all the distinctive doctrinal characteristics of the English Church of the Reformation and, in addition, has at last grasped and formulated the transforming conception of authority which is that Church's charter. Reason — not common reason, but the logic of man's

whole personality — is seen to be the only medium of Revelation. By means of it, the old conflicting authorities at last are reconciled; for Reason reveals the authority of the Church to be but the expression of its own authority in the persons of Apostles, Saints and Scholars; and that of the Bible to be a similar expression of itself in the Prophets and Evangelists who wrote its books. Therefore in each succeeding age we can but be guided by the consensus of the best knowledge available — a consensus of spiritual truths as witnessed to by saints; of historical truths as witnessed to after criticism of the relevant documents; of assured *new* truths as presented by acknowledged scholars in each age as it comes. Spiritual truths become the only essentials; and they prove to be those which we saw distinctive of the English Church in the period of its new birth in the sixteenth century: belief in God and Jesus Christ; in Man, his appointed duty, free-will to perform it, and immortality; in the Holy Spirit, and Its supreme sphere of operation, the Spiritual Brotherhood of man, the Church. About all other doctrines we now cease to be dogmatic so long as they do not violate the new view of Revelation which all along has been implicit in the Reformed English Church. Their interplay will but be fruitful in the continual search of the Church on earth for an ever higher theology — a search that can, however, only reach its goal in heaven, when all shall have been gathered into the Church Triumphant, and the Love of God and the Knowledge of God shall be one.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE NATION

By Dr. J. M. Creed, Ely Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

I.

WE search in vain in the pages of the New Testament for any notion of a national Christian Church. In so far as the conception of a national Church is to be found in the apostolic age, it is connected with the parent faith of Judaism, and for the most part stands as a foil to the universal Church of Christ. From the very beginning the Christian movement had in principle transcended the exclusive tendency of Judaism. The forerunner, speaking in the spirit of an Amos or an Isaiah, had denounced judgment upon the chosen race: 'Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father, for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham.' Jesus Himself is sent to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' but the privileges of the house of Israel as such are set aside. It will be more tolerable in the Judgment for the heathen cities of Tyre and Sidon than for the unrepentant generation of Jews to which He preached. It was a true and legitimate development from this preaching — though the conclusion was not always drawn — when the new society began to incorporate within itself believers from the pagan world without insisting on circumcision as a necessary preliminary or accompaniment. Faith in the Messiah Jesus, crucified, risen, and to come again, ratified by Baptism in His name, was the ground of acceptance in the new Israel. Thus Christianity became, what it must ever remain, a universal faith. Jesus Christ is the Second Adam and His Church is in principle the race redeemed.

The universalizing of religion was achieved by a movement of theology and faith within the society of believers. It is not to be explained in terms of general causes operative in the world at large. None the less a history of the early Church cannot ignore general conditions which favoured and fostered the spread of Christianity. If the world in the first century was not quite

'of one speech and language,' yet one language would carry a traveller almost anywhere. With the common language there came a common stock of ideas. Stoicism had accustomed men to think in terms of human brotherhood transcending the divisions of peoples and classes. Last but not least the inhabited world — or what for practical purposes was taken to be such — was under the rule of a single central authority. It was an age when it was easy to think in terms of the human race, and the field was open then, as it has seldom been open before or since, for a new faith in the redemption of mankind. When the new faith came it readily took up into itself certain elements in the existing cosmopolitan culture. Especially were affinities traced between the universal and humane ethic of the Christian Church and similar aspects of Stoic teaching. The apparently Christian tendency of Seneca had been observed by Tertullian. *Seneca saepe noster*, he writes. 'Seneca, often our own.' And in this especially Stoic and Christian were at one, that national distinctions counted for nothing. Both looked at mankind against a background of a 'Law of Nature,' more ultimate than any local code. For both the conception of nationhood was swallowed up in the conception of a universal state, which was also a *Civitas Dei*. 'Christians live upon the earth,' says the writer to Diognetus, 'but their citizenship is in heaven'; and 'the Stoics say,' observes Clement of Alexandria, 'that heaven is the true city, and that as for the earth there are no cities there. There are indeed cities so-called, but they are not cities indeed.' In such a world the Catholic Church could make a home, and perhaps in no other age could the universal character of the Christian Church have established itself. What was then secured must never be lost.

II.

But another age must adopt other means to attain the same end. If we would measure the difference between the early Christian centuries and our own time, we may well turn our eyes to the city of Rome. To-day, as nineteen centuries ago, Rome is a city of world-wide significance. First, it is the centre of the largest existing Christian Church, a Church which, like its pagan prototype the Roman Empire, has learnt to claim universal sway. The Papal polity took shape in an age when the nations

of the West, often barely conscious of themselves as nations, lived within the great commonwealth of the Latin Church and its less effective counterpart, the Holy Roman Empire. The dream of a Church, ruling by Divine Right over the nations of the world, still inspires the policy and the utterances of the Roman See. But those days have passed, never to return. The Holy Roman Empire has gone, and the European world is divided between sovereign national states. Some of these states have long refused recognition to the claims of the Papacy, and almost forget that they once owed it allegiance. When the Pope lately testified to his 'fatherly love' for England, many Englishmen did not understand the meaning of his words. In other states where his spiritual Primacy is still acknowledged, the functions of the hierarchy are carefully restricted, and clerical activities are usually combatted by an intransigent opposition. Rome's history makes it hard for her to arrive at a true understanding with a nation state. Inheriting from the Middle Age a super-national character, she lives uneasily in a world where nation-states have become the accepted form of political association.

Among these nation-states one of the most prominent to-day is Italy itself, the latest born of European nationalities, now foremost representative of a new type of self-sufficient and aggressive nationalism. Mussolini, as well as the Pope, reigns in the Eternal City. Mussolini looks back to the past imperial grandeur of Rome and would fain think of himself as heir of the Caesars. But the analogy is superficial. The Rome of the Caesars was capital of the world. The circumstances of our time make it unthinkable that the Rome of Mussolini should ever fill that place. Widely as his ideals differ from those of the Risorgimento, Mussolini cannot but be the heir of Garibaldi, Mazzini and Cavour. His Italy is and will remain a national state alongside other national states, and he exemplifies the truth that the national state is the given form of political association for our time. If a universal commonwealth — our sorest need — is to come at all, it can only come through some form of league of nations. The nations cannot now be made one through any universal power of empire whether temporal or spiritual. The only hope is that the several nations, recognizing their inter-

dependence, shall safeguard themselves and each other by the establishment of a common law. The universal mind must work through national forms. The national unit cannot be absorbed or ignored. For us then 'national' and 'universal' are not antithetical terms. A national state which exalts itself as the sole and supreme object of loyalty for its subjects is indeed a danger to the commonwealth of mankind, but the danger must be met by eliciting the wider loyalty from within the nation. No other policy is really possible.

Civil and ecclesiastical organization never have been and never can be wholly unrelated. Organized Churches cannot ignore differences of language, culture, sentiment and tradition — the kind of differences which go to constitute nationhood. Certainly we cannot allow that these differences are constitutive of the Church as such. A Christendom which ceased to think of itself as in principle one with the race redeemed would indeed be apostate at a crucial point. The idea of a national Church may be — and I am arguing that it is — a legitimate and even, for us, a necessary idea, but for the Christian Faith it is not an ultimate idea. In Christendom a national Church must know itself to be one among others. This differentiates the idea of a national Church as it is known to us from the idea of a national Church as it was known to and, on the whole, repudiated by, the first Christians. The notion that *a* national Church is *the* Catholic Church is at once felt to be preposterous. But given our world, the idea of a national Church is as right as it is natural. A co-ordinated world-wide system of national Churches seems to be the type of ecclesiastical organization proper to our time. How else can the Christian faith so readily relate itself to the actual life and thought of men?

III.

I have as yet stated in general terms the contention that organic union between Church and Nation is a true and valuable form of Church life. The union may present itself primarily as an inheritance from the past, or primarily as a task to be achieved, or as both at once. In any case such union, I have argued, is legitimate and desirable in principle. But the union may take very different forms, and it would be unwise to argue

that any one form is in principle the true form. We need not go beyond our own island to see two Churches, both national in name and constitution, both acknowledged as national by the same state, yet related to nation and to state in fundamentally divergent ways. The differences in constitution are deep laid in the historical experiences of the two peoples, and they answer to real differences in circumstance and sentiment which are vital at this hour. At the period of the Reformation the Kirk helped Scotland to discover a national consciousness, often in the teeth of opposition from the State. Since then the Scottish King, and later the Scottish Parliament migrated to London. But the Kirk has remained, jealous of its independence, and in its jealousy, giving expression to national feeling. The General Assembly meets at Edinburgh with the pomp and dignity which befit the national Church of a proud people. There is nothing to correspond to this in England. Our Prelates have their place of dignity. They are an Order in this Church and Realm. But there has never been an ecclesiastical body in England which represents the Church as such, and as a whole. It is only necessary to mention our new Church Assembly in this connexion to feel the difference between ourselves and our Scottish brethren. More than this, neither the clergy (who keep Convocation in reserve for really important occasions), nor the English people generally, have any real desire to see a strong Church Assembly. But it does not follow that our Church of England is not in a true and effective sense a national Church. It is. And what makes and keeps it national is that the English people consider it to be such, and through Crown and Parliament act upon their belief. The King is 'over all persons and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil, supreme.' King and Parliament have legislated continuously in Church matters from the time of the Tudors to this present day; their competence so to act cannot be disputed without stultifying our whole history. But the Church of England is a highly complex phenomenon, and the taunt that the Church of England is merely a Parliamentary Church is not warranted. King and Parliament have legislated for an already existing Church. They have never claimed to create the Church or, of themselves, to delegate the ministry of Word and Sacraments.

This ministry is a spiritual function. It is exercised under conditions which have been fixed by the legislature, and which have never been changed without its assent, but the ministry is not itself derived from the State. When the Elizabethan Settlement was carried through, it was found impossible to bring the new legislation into force without depriving the existing hierarchy, and overruling the Convocations. To this extent there was a real breach of continuity. But with a care, characteristic of the English mind, every effort was made, and was made successfully, to maintain continuity of Order. Moreover, the number of parish clergymen who refused to accept the Royal Supremacy and the Book of Common Prayer was small. The clergy did not receive the cure of souls from Parliament or Crown, but they had to agree to exercise their spiritual function according to the settlement which the Queen and Parliament had enacted. I suggest that through the subsequent centuries we may see these two factors balancing one another more or less successfully—the relative independence of the clergy within the limits of the law, and the legislative control over the Church of King and Parliament, and that in the balance of these two constant factors we may find the key to the distinctive characteristics of the English Church, in its strength and also in its weaknesses. Thus the Church of England has been intimately associated with the nation organized as a state: when the State has been tyrannous, the Church has too readily acquiesced. Again: the Church is administered under the hierarchical system of mediaeval Catholicism: too easily this passes into an exaggeration of the powers and authority of the clerical executive. These are our besetting dangers. But let us not fail to notice how closely they are related to some of the especial merits of Anglicanism. The intimate relation between the Church of England and the State, though liable to abuse, has been productive of good in that it has tended to strengthen the Church in a sense of responsibility for the nation and to guard liberty and comprehension within the Church. Again, the relative independence of the ministers of Word and Sacraments, though it may be perverted into an undesirable clericalism, may also enable a clergyman to play a valuable and independent part as leader and counsellor in his parish and on appropriate issues in the community at large.

IV.

The balance of forces in the constitution of our national Church is well illustrated by an issue which the conditions of contemporary social life have pressed upon our attention. The Houses of Convocation in both Provinces lately appointed a Joint Committee to deal with the grave problems of marriage and the marriage law. Plainly the question is one which affects intimately both nation and Church, and if not carefully handled it might disturb the constitution in Church and State. The deliberations of the Joint Committee have issued in a Majority Report and two Minority Reports. There are very important divergences between these Reports, but they all handle the problems with an evident desire to promote reform in a system which, as it stands, is, by general consent, most unsatisfactory. A disquieting feature of the Report as a whole is that though the Majority in the text of their Report go far, in certain places, towards admitting the justice of the contentions of the Minority, in their recommendations they assume that the Church of England as such is committed in principle to their own view, and they wish to see the view of the clerical Minority ruled out as illegitimate. It is assumed by the Majority that the re-marriage of a party to a divorce suit during the lifetime of a partner, is from the nature of the case an infringement of the Christian code, even though the person in question may have been the innocent victim of a partner's misconduct. It is proposed that the existing practice of the Church of England should be changed and that any such re-marriage in Church should be made illegal. Moreover, they propose that no such person should be admitted to Communion without receiving absolution from the Bishop from what is assumed to be in itself a sinful act, rendering the person concerned *ipso facto* excommunicate, unless and until the Bishop condones the supposed sin. The Minority defend an existing right, and question alike the wisdom and the justice of submitting an otherwise innocent person to these disabilities in deference to the supposed Christian principle that no marriage should in any circumstances be dissolved. It is well known that this supposed principle is not in fact recognized by other Reformed Churches, or by the Orthodox

Churches of the East. In our own Church the principle has never since the Reformation been unconditionally admitted; it has been repudiated by many authoritative teachers; and it is safe to say that it is not recognized by a large majority of professing Churchmen. In an Appendix, on Nullity of Marriage, which is referred to with commendation in the Majority Report, Chancellor H. B. Vaisey translates the assumption which underlies the position of the Majority into a definite assertion: 'It cannot be doubted,' he writes, 'that the divorce *a vinculo* is definitely and plainly inconsistent with the precepts of the Church; no impartial reader of the Marriage Service in the Book of Common Prayer could arrive at any other conclusion' (p. 70). In view of the notorious fact that many eminent Anglican divines have used the Marriage Service and held a contrary opinion, this must be pronounced a strange utterance. I will briefly explain why I consider that Chancellor Vaisey's opinion cannot be sustained. It will be agreed that the marriage vows and the preceding questions of the priest assert strongly that the vows are vows of a life-long union. It must also be agreed that divorce *a vinculo* makes, or claims to make, the vows inoperative. But in the view of Christians who allow the legitimacy and even, in certain circumstances, the desirability of the divorce *a vinculo*, it is still essential that the words 'till death us do part' should remain in the marriage vow, in order to express the intention of both parties to contract a life-long union —which intention is necessary to the conception of Christian marriage. To argue that these words determine the illegitimacy of divorce *a vinculo* would be as unreasonable as to contend that the words 'to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part' determine the illegitimacy of the separation *a mensa et toro* allowed by Canon Law. All the other relevant passages in the Marriage Service are either quotations from or paraphrases of Biblical texts. Now the legal implications of these texts are admittedly uncertain, and the weight of opinion is against the view that indissolubility of marriage, as understood in Western Canon Law, is involved. If this uncertainty attaches to the implications of the texts in Scripture—reinforced by the certainty that two famous texts

flatly contradict the proposed construction — then the same uncertainty must attach to the legal implications of these texts when used in the Marriage Service.

This digression on the Marriage Law is not irrelevant to the subject of this paper, for it is highly probable that the problems in which we are involved will be held to raise constitutional issues, and it is certain that they illustrate the working of constitutional principles. It is plausible to argue that the Church should settle its own concerns with marriage and that the State should make its marriage law without direct regard to Christian principles or to the Church. But such a separation would rest upon a misapprehension of the situation. I do not forget and I hope I do not under-estimate the propaganda which aims at undermining the permanence of the marriage tie. It is a symptom which we must anxiously observe. But I would urge that this propaganda does not reflect the general mind of the community. The generality of men and women are closely concerned to uphold the permanence of the marriage bond, and I think it may be said that they wish this aim to govern whatever fresh legislation may be found necessary. If this is so, the aim of the Church, and the aim of society in general, cannot be regarded in isolation from each other. I gladly recognize that the Majority Report, which I have criticized in certain respects, shows a refreshing willingness to reconsider legal procedure and to co-operate with the State, always subject to the necessary proviso 'that any proposed amendment [of the Law] does not tend to make marriage a temporary alliance, or to undermine the foundations of family life' (p. 32). Plainly there would be great unwillingness to allow a radical separation of Church and State at this crucial point. But with the Majority Report and Resolutions of the Convocation Committee on our hands we are left with a sufficiently difficult problem in adjustment. If indeed we admitted the competence of a majority of the Clerical Synods to bind a decision upon the Church without further sanctions, the problem might well be thought insoluble. Fortunately we are forbidden by Anglican principles to allow this power to a majority of the Clerical Order. If it be true — and I have little doubt that it is — that in this case the clerical minority has the support of a majority of the lay members of the

Church, that should ensure the ultimate defeat of a proposal to suppress differences and to assert that the view of the clerical majority is not only tolerable, but obligatory. That claim we resist with a good conscience; we resist as Churchmen, and, thanks to the balance of our constitution, with good hope of success. We cannot be suppressed unless the laity are satisfied that we are wrong, and our constitution provides for the necessity of lay consent before 'the liberty to forbid' can be made operative. If, as I hope and expect, these safeguards are adequate, the cry will no doubt be raised that there is conflict between Church and State. Let us be clear beforehand what our attitude will be. We shall not deny that a real conflict might arise. It is for instance theoretically conceivable that the State in England might seek to oblige clergymen to marry any divorced person who was legally competent to contract another marriage and who expressed a wish to be married in church. Such action would undoubtedly be felt to be intolerable and would be resisted. Let us at once add that the public conscience would be as much scandalized as the clergy, and that we may be certain that the contingency will not arise. The public expects the clergy to uphold, as best it can, the sanctity of the marriage bond. That issue is not in dispute. The question is whether those Churchmen who hold that the marriage bond is in all circumstances indissoluble are to be allowed to impose their views on their fellow-Churchmen, who, with weighty support, dissent from this position. At this point the Christian laity, most effectively represented, as things are, in Parliament, have a moral as well as a legal right to speak.

This marriage question brings out admirably the practical working of our constitution as a National Church. The place of Crown and Parliament in our constitution is not, as is so often suggested nowadays by partisan writers, an anomalous accident, but a fundamental factor in our Church life, deep-rooted in our history as a people and as a Church, conditioning our development at every stage. From the marriage question which is now before us we can see how easily it may come about that Crown or Parliament will be called upon again, as so often in the past, to correct the excesses of a dominant party. I suppose that there is still some hope that a clash may be averted. It is to be

presumed that the Bishops will not attempt to act upon the procedure which has been approved without first referring the matter to the Church Assembly. It would greatly strengthen the position of that body if it gave decisive expression to the opposition which this new policy, if persisted in, will certainly provoke. And it would certainly be an advantage to keep the controversy out of Parliament and the Courts, if it can be done. If it cannot be done, we shall, when called upon, defend our convictions as Churchmen, through Parliament. The legislative control of Crown and Parliament is not less essential to our ecclesiastical polity than the hierarchical principle. The two elements, as I have already suggested, balance one another, and the peculiar ethos of the Church of England may be traced to this co-ordination of functions in Church and State.

V.

Greatly as I value the English ecclesiastical tradition, I wish to guard against misunderstanding. I do not urge that it is the one true norm for a national Church. It is the outcome of our own religious and political history. Appropriate as I think it to England, I can see that it would not do everywhere. But England and the English Church are our subject now. I can see no serious reason why we should not hand on the main principles of the ecclesiastical polity we have inherited. But I do not refuse to contemplate the possibility of great changes. If changes come, they may be far greater than our would-be reformers seem yet to have envisaged. If for instance the position of Crown and Parliament were seriously changed, other issues would be involved—first and foremost the method of Church government, and the powers of the Governors. We may have to pass through a period of disintegration, and it is not inconceivable that in the end a new type of Church of England might issue from the chaos.

I will not try to forecast the future in greater detail than to say that the forces making for National Churches are not likely to grow weaker as the years go by. It is to be hoped that the extravagant nationalism of some European countries will soon pass. The exaltation of the national group as the supreme object of loyalty is a threat to civilization, and we shall not

withhold our sympathy, and so far as we can give it, our support from our fellow-Christians who see the universal faith of Christ threatened by a new idolatry. All the more important that those Churches which are not confronted with the same extravagant type of state-cult should use their opportunities to establish or to maintain happier and healthier relations with the State. The abnormal conditions of contemporary Germany may teach us much, but they do not make good precedents for ourselves. Hitlerism may pass. The German people will certainly endure. We shall live for ages yet to come in a world grouped in national societies. These societies reflect in varied forms the universal mind. The universal faith must find itself in national Churches within these national groups. It is not absurd to hope that the peculiar history and characteristics of our own communion may enable it to make a worthy contribution to the Christian polities of the future.

PROBLEMS OF CHURCH OF ENGLAND MEMBERSHIP

By the Rev. J. F. Clayton, M.C., M.A., Reader of the Temple.

AMONG the many stories recorded by the late Canon Ainger is the following. A sergeant was interviewing a recruit for the army; on asking the young man to what denomination he belonged he received the reply, 'I don't believe anything,' to which the sergeant rejoined severely, 'None of your nonsense, sir; understand this—until you do, you are a member of the Church of England.'

This story has a meaning for others besides those clergy who have held a chaplain's commission in the army; and the situation might arise in any country where convention requires that men in the public service must profess some sort of religion, and where there is some denomination to which such men can attach themselves merely because they do not belong to any other.

For a discussion of the problems of membership, 'Churches' can be divided into three groups.

First, there is the fundamental cleavage between a Catholic Church which claims an infallible authority to which the individual must submit his private judgment, and a Protestant Church which, whatever its organization or method of worship, allows the individual to think for himself. Then among the Protestant Churches there is a further division between those which claim to express the religion of a nation large or small and those which regard themselves as minorities gathered out of a nation which need not even be Christian.

Each type of Church has its own problem of membership. The Roman Catholic Church has perhaps the easiest task; it makes its rules, and if its members disobey them they get into trouble, and in the last resort they may be excommunicated; yet there are many nominal Catholics who, without having been excommunicated, have ceased to perform the minimum of obligation, and the problem of 'lapsed members' is not peculiar to the Protestant Churches.

A Protestant Church that claims to express the Christianity of a nation obviously cannot limit its attentions to the minority who are devout; consequently it must aim at being inclusive rather than exclusive, and an inclusive Church has to face the risk of having many useless members.

In the sixteenth century Lutherans and Calvinists agreed that a Christian state should have a Church as the official version of the Protestant religion; and the few who dissented from this view were regarded as 'sectaries,' nearly as objectionable as those who had refused to accept the Reformation. In the twentieth century the position taken at the Reformation only by a few sects is now taken by many who belong to Churches that claim, or once claimed, to be national. It is argued that civilization is becoming more and more secularized, and that Churches should regard themselves as minority movements gathered out of the non-Christian state.

Obviously the problem of membership is easier in these minority movements than in Churches which claim to guide the conscience of a still Christian nation. Within the Anglican Communion both these types of Protestant Church are to be found. The Established Church of England still claims to be the spiritual home of as many as possible of the citizens of a state that has not yet renounced Christianity.

In Wales and in Ireland Churches formerly Established have now been disestablished, and in Ireland the Episcopal Church is that of a minority in opposition to a dominant Roman Catholic population. In Scotland the Episcopalian Church is a dissenting body very conscious of its dissidence from the Presbyterian Church which represents the main body of organized Christianity in that country. In the mission field the Churches are generally minority movements that have to hold their own in the midst of heathen populations; discipline of varying severity is imposed, the most rigid probably being that of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa. In all these minority Churches the problem of membership is likely to be less complicated than in the Established Church of England with which they are in communion.

In this paper we are concerned only with membership in the Established Church of England; and the problem resolves

itself into three questions:

1. Who are members of that Church?
2. What are the obligations of membership?
3. What measures can be taken against defaulters?

---

1. Who are members of the Church of England?

Those who piloted this country through the Reformation desired that every citizen in a Christian nation should be a member of a Christian Church expressing the religion of that nation; in 1559 there were many divergent views held on important questions by English Christians; hence a national Church would have to be comprehensive. Accordingly the settlement effected in 1559 (which is still in force) tried to comprehend in a national reformed Church all who would at the one extreme renounce the Pope and certain Romish errors, and who at the other extreme could bring themselves to obey bishops and use the prescribed prayer-book. During Elizabeth's reign two small minorities dissented from this national Church, namely, the Papists and the Independents; the Elizabethan theory was expressed in the eighth book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* as follows:

> 'There is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any man a member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England' (ch. 1, s. 4).

The genuineness of this book has been questioned, but if in its present form it is a production of the middle of the seventeenth century, it shows how the unity of the Christian State and the Christian Church persisted until at least a generation after the age of Elizabeth.

At that time Non-conformity WITHIN the national Church was probably a greater problem than that of Dissent OUTSIDE. The Act of Uniformity in 1662 drove into Dissent many who had hitherto been Nonconformists within the national Church; and in 1689 orthodox Protestant dissent received legal toleration. It is doubtful whether all the Dissenters in 1689 wished to cut themselves off from the national Church. Thus many dissenters continued to communicate occasionally in their parish churches, and there is no reason to suppose that in every case

this was merely a 'bowing down in the house of Rimmon' in order to qualify for political office under the terms of the Test Act of 1673; possibly many of them sought by such occasional communion to retain some link with the Church that they had left, perhaps left with reluctance. In 1711 an act passed by a Tory government tried to stop this practice; the provisions were that any one qualifying for office under the Test Act who, within twelve months of communicating in the Established Church, should frequent a conventicle, be liable to punishment. The Act did not forbid dissenters to come to the Communion, nor did it say anything about the necessity of Confirmation as a necessary condition of such communion. The Act was repealed within a few years when the Whigs came into power with the house of Hanover.

Occasionally the question of what constitutes membership has been the subject of a legal decision. Thus in 1898 there was the case of Perry's Almshouses at Winterbourne near Bristol. The foundress had directed that applicants for admission must have attended the parish church and have been communicants for a prescribed period, and that they must be persons of righteous and sober life. When the case came before the court of appeal the appellants submitted that these conditions could be fulfilled by others besides members of the Church of England and that non-members who reached this standard of decency and fulfilled the religious observances could be admitted to the almshouses. The court held that only members of the Church of England could fulfil the conditions; but the judgment did not rule conversely that those who do not fulfil these conditions are not members of the Church of England.

Again, when a member of the Ecclesiastical Commission takes office he has to declare himself a member of the Church of England; but apparently it rests with the Commissioner's own conscience as to what the membership involves. Similarly candidates for certain scholarships have to sign a formula declaring themselves members of the Church of England, but as a rule that phrase commits the signatory to very little.

Then in 1919 came the Enabling Act which imposed on the Church of England electoral rolls, parochial church councils, and a national assembly. For admission to an electoral roll the

applicant must have reached the age of eighteen; he must have been baptized; and he must not be a member of any religious body not in communion with the Church of England. For election to a parochial church council, a further condition is imposed; the candidate must be a communicant.

The new legislation has not solved the problem of membership in the Established Church. As the Confirmation and Communicant tests were expressly rejected, it is plainly illegal and illogical to insist that no one can be regarded as a member unless he has been confirmed or unless he is a communicant; hence all baptized adults who are not actually members of some other body have a right to be included on the roll, even though they never attend the services and contribute nothing to the support of the Church to which they profess to belong.

The condition as to not being a member of some other religious body is reasonable if an enemy of the Established Church claims the right to attack it from within. But it should be remembered that many dissenters wish well to the Church from which they or their forefathers dissented, and that among the Methodists there are probably some who would still like to support their chapel without severing their connection altogether with the parish church.

More delicate is the question raised by those persons of Scottish descent living in England who, while loyal and communicant members of the Established Church of England when they are in England, consider themselves members of the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland when they are north of the border; and *vice versa*. The case has not been made the subject of a legal decision, but, so far as I am aware, I do not think that one who is a Presbyterian when in Scotland would be disqualified from admission to an electoral roll if living in England. But if so, the Act should have been more carefully drafted.

The Enabling Act then left matters as they were except that it excluded those who are members of other denominations; so, while it keeps out some religious individuals who might be a considerable strength to us, it leaves us with those who, though not belonging to any other Church, do little for their own Church except stay away from it.

For membership in a parochial church council the Communicant test is imposed, though it is a little difficult to decide what constitutes a 'communicant.' It has been ruled that the law is satisfied if the person concerned states that he has communicated once within the last twelve months, not necessarily at the church of which he aspires to be a 'councillor.'

It may be of interest to compare the rules as to membership in the Church of England with those of our sister communion, the Church of Scotland. In that Church membership means communicant membership, and a member ceases to be such if he has failed to communicate within the last three years. Those who are regular attendants at the services but not communicants are known as 'adherents.' Until recently only 'members' had the right of voting on such matters as the appointment of a minister; but under certain conditions 'adherents' may also share this privilege.

For membership in a Kirk Session, the pattern which the Anglican Parochial Church Councils were expected to copy, a would-be 'Elder' must of course be a communicant, and in the dispensing of that sacrament the elders take a prominent part.

It will be seen that the standard required for membership in the Established Church of England is less rigorous than that which has always obtained in the Reformed Church in Scotland.

2. What are the obligations of membership?

If Baptism is necessary for membership, then the obligations of membership are those involved in the Baptismal vows, vows which are morally binding whether confirmed or not at years of discretion. But if failure to fulfil these were to involve loss of membership, the members of the Church would be nil; and further, no human tribunal could decide how far they have been observed or broken. Hence the extent to which these obligations are to be honoured rests with the individual's own conscience.

If we turn from the obligations of moral duty to those of ceremonial observance, we find that the Prayer-book expects all adult members to communicate three times a year, and that of these three occasions Easter shall be one.

A conscientious layman will not content himself with this minimum of observance; if he is a communicant he may indeed think one communion a year sufficient, and many of the most loyal of our laity do not come more frequently; or for various reasons he may decide not to be a communicant; but many non-communicants and many infrequent communicants are loyal to their Church both by regular attendance at Sunday worship (concerning which the Prayer-book does not actually lay down any rule), by the generosity of their financial support, and above all by a healthy and charitable influence in parochial concerns. But as the limits of membership are wide enough to include some whose membership seems only nominal, so the obligations of membership must be left to the conscience of the individual member.

3. What measures can be taken against defaulters?

The rubric in the Burial Service forbidding its use over those who have died excommunicate suggests that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries some measure of discipline was contemplated against those who were hopelessly disloyal. Whatever may have been done at that time, little or no discipline is possible now.

In 1876 a Bristol incumbent, the Rev. Flavell Cook, tried to repel from communion a Mr. Jenkins on the ground that he held unorthodox views about the authority of Scripture and the personality of the devil. Mr. Jenkins sued the incumbent, but the court held that it was not proved that Mr. Jenkins held the views for which he had been censured; the incumbent, I understand, resigned the living.

In 1908, in the case of Banister *v.* Thompson, it was held that a person may not be repelled from communion as an evil-liver merely because he has contracted a marriage under the Deceased Wife's Sister's Act.

There is a rubric authorizing the exclusion from communion of those who are notorious evil-livers or are living in a state of malice and hatred; but in either case the cleric (or the bishop) would have to prove the charge to the satisfaction of the court; otherwise he would probably be sued for libel. Hence except in the case of some very flagrant violation of certain parts of the

Christian moral law, it is difficult to see what measures can be taken against members whose conduct is unsatisfactory.

With regard to neglect of public worship or refusal to give adequately to the support of one's Church, it is obvious that no disciplinary measures are even thinkable. In this connection it is scarcely necessary to observe that the payment of tithes is a legal obligation arising out of the ownership of land, not out of membership in the Church.

From this survey it seems that in the Church of England membership and the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of its duties are left to the conscience of the individual. Certainly the Church of England recognizes no such tribunal as the presbyterial courts beloved of the Calvinists and disliked by the Zwinglians in the sixteenth century; and on the rare occasions when a disciplinarian clergyman has tried to excommunicate those whom he thinks unworthy he has been quickly brought to order either by his bishop or a court of law. Hence the Church of England cannot satisfy those disciplinarians who would censure or expel those who do not come up to their standard of Churchmanship in orthodoxy or conduct.

At times the dead-weight of nominal members who give their Church no support, either moral, devotional or financial, worries even those who desire a comprehensive national Church free from clerical tyranny. At such moments of disgust it is suggested that public opinion in this country is becoming more indifferent or more hostile to the Christian ideas of Duty, God and Immortality; that the Christians in England represent a minority movement; that the so-called national Church is no longer the religious guide of the nation and that it should therefore cease to pretend to be that which it is not. It is further argued that if what is now the Church of England should surrender the prestige of its State connection, the slackers would drop off and we should be a compact body, small perhaps in numbers, but supported only by those who take their Churchmanship seriously. Possibly those who are attracted by this point of view draw alluring pictures of such minority Churches as the Episcopalian communion in Scotland with its rigid view of Episcopacy and its comparatively high proportion of com-

municants, or of the Disestablished Church in Ireland with its sturdy Protestantism and its loyal membership; while some perhaps would like to copy the moral and theological discipline that is carried out in the dioceses belonging to the Universities' Mission to Central Africa.

Such misgivings as to the maintenance of the *status quo* are becoming more frequent as the result of events on the Continent; it is therefore reasonable to put to the advocates of change the question which I believe was put by the Erastian lawyer John Selden to the Presbyterian and other enthusiasts in 1643 who wished to subvert the existing constitution of the national Church; the question was, 'What will you put in its place?'

Suppose that a narrower basis of membership were substituted for that which was allowed by the Enabling Act, namely, the communicant test. If so, we should lose many who, though not communicants, are a source of moral strength to us, and, as the battle to-day is between Christianity and some form of Secularism, the loss of so many Christians would be serious. Further, as a matter of experience, can even a clergyman maintain that the average communicant is always or even usually more Christian in character than many Christians, at present also Churchmen, who prefer not to receive that sacrament?

Or suppose that some rule of attendance at church and of financial contributions were imposed. I question whether the result would be any improvement on the present position; some who are now generous would show their resentment of such rules by giving less than they give now; and compulsory churchgoing would probably no more make the average layman in civil life religious than the compulsory church parade made for religion in the army during the war.

Or suppose that a code of discipline were established and defaulters had to appear before a so-called 'spiritual court.' No doubt certain moral offences could be visited, perhaps with severity; but it is questionable whether such a tribunal could punish those who by their want of charity and even of truthfulness, by their jealousy and bad-temper, by their cruelties and dishonesty have probably done more to damage the good name of their Church than some of those who have broken the seventh commandment. After a few years of such ecclesiastical tyranny,

some who at this moment are willing to try such discipline would probably wish to restore the easy-going system which we have to-day.

The demand for a small Church of enthusiasts is no new cry; there have been such Puritan movements ever since the Montanists of the second century: and the history of most of such small Churches has been a record of arrogance, intolerance and internal quarrels which have gone far to neutralize the respect evoked by consistency, courage, and fidelity to conscience.

The Church of England has never as yet accepted the position of the 'little Church' apart from or in opposition to the State; hitherto it has been ever since the Reformation 'the Reformed Branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church established in this realm,' just as the Church of Scotland with a different form of organization performs a similar function in that country.

But a national and reformed Church should be consistent. Thus a Reformed or Protestant Church is committed to the principle of Private Judgment; and it is inconsistent to demand such freedom of judgment for ourselves until we have got what we want, and then, when other people in the exercise of that private judgment go further than we like, to turn round and invoke the principle of 'Authority' belonging to Catholicism. Further, we have seen that the Reformed or Protestant Churches may be divided into two groups, the national Churches and the churches gathered out of the nation. The former has responsibilities towards a wider circle than the latter can reach; and therefore we have no right to impose on a large and comprehensive Church a discipline which is congruous with a small society of Christians sharing the same enthusiasm.

Granted that the Church of England respects the Protestant right of Private Judgment, it has still to choose between two positions, which some might indicate by the alternatives 'national Church' or 'denomination.' Either alternative is likely to involve some things that we dislike; but having chosen the one it is, to say the least, inconsistent to behave as if we had chosen the other.

This treatment of the problem of membership in the Church of England may provoke the wrath of members of some parts of

the Anglican Communion, who will object that in their church such slackness is not allowed. To this criticism the subject requires me to reply that we are only concerned with membership in the Established Church of England. Other parts of the Anglican Communion have the right to make whatever rules they think fit for the discipline of their own members; but they cannot impose that discipline on those of us who are members not of some other branch of the Anglican Communion but of the Established Church of God, and, as we have seen, this Church does not indulge in the so-called godly discipline for which some Churchmen past and present have craved.

But in supporting the *status quo*, one reservation must be made. The alliance of Church and State on what is often termed an Erastian basis can only be defended when the State is, broadly speaking, Christian. If responsible public opinion becomes anti-Christian, or if pressure is put by the Government on the Church to acquiesce in measures which are plainly opposed to Christianity, then of course the separation of Church and State would have to be demanded by the Church; as a result the Church might find itself in the position of the Christians under the Roman empire before Constantine came to terms with them; to some the return to the position of the Church in the so-called 'persecution period' seems attractive, though, as far as one can tell, the Church in those days was certainly not free from unpleasant or even from unworthy members.

Some who formerly believed in the laxer theory of membership as now existing have reluctantly come to the conclusion that public opinion in England is following the anti-Christian lead of certain continental countries; if so, they are consistent in demanding the dissolution of the partnership of Church and State, to be followed by a purge of unworthy members as the result of this revolution in our constitution.

The defence of the *status quo* put forward in this paper is based on the premise that at present public opinion in Great Britain is still sufficiently Christian to warrant the continuance of the Established Churches in England and in Scotland. With the Scottish Church we are not here concerned; as to the Church of England I submit that, under its present constitution and with its present lack of 'discipline,' it still expresses the religious

genius of the English people better than if its membership were smaller, and its obligations enforced with rigour.

In conclusion I will make two quotations in support of this contention. The first is from the late Mr. Alfred Fawkes' pamphlet, *Shall we Disestablish?* On p. 37 he says:

> 'It has been said that the distinctive mission of the Church of England is the Apostolate of the Indevout.'

It may perhaps be said that Mr. Fawkes represented a phase of English religious thought which has now passed away, yet the same idea is expressed in different language in a very recent book by Canon Barry, who at all events is in touch with the thoughts of the younger generation. In the introduction to his lectures on *The Relevance of the Church* he says:

> 'In one diocese our Church has taken its stand stiffly on the strictest formularies of Churchmanship; its membership consists of the clergy and a small circle of the devout, while the great mass of the laity are outside. In the other it is functioning as the conscience of the English-speaking community and supplying the leadership and inspiration of all its moral and religious ideals. The official policy of the latter diocese may be censured in the former as lax — but which of the two has understood best the true and authentic Anglican tradition?'

And if the sanction of the highest authority is invoked for this lack of ecclesiastical discipline in a comprehensive Church, remember our Founder's parable of the Wheat and the Tares, a warning against ill-considered measures begun with the laudable aim of keeping a Church pure but resulting in branding that Church with the stigma of folly and injustice.

THE ENGLISH TRADITION OF THE OFFICE AND WORK OF A BISHOP

By the Rev. Professor Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil.

'AS a bishop,' it was said of Mandell Creighton by one of his episcopal brethren, 'he seemed to think much of the duty of a bishop with regard to the corporate life, the history of the Church, the position of the Church as a body in the world — and the bishop was to rule, but it was to be the rule of knowledge and thought, not of arbitrary will.'[1] It would be difficult to find a definition of the ideal of the episcopal office which better preserves the balance between its local and wider responsibilities than this description of the practice of Creighton. For the office and work of a bishop are to be exercised in three related, yet distinguishable spheres; within the diocese and territorial jurisdiction committed to the charge of the diocesan episcopate, within the wider field of that branch of Christ's Catholic Church from which the bishop's spiritual commission has been derived, and in the widest sphere of all, that of the relation of the Church to the world, a sphere embracing not only the particular relations of Church and State, but the entire complex of questions concerning the position of the Church and the peoples which it serves. During the successive centuries of Christian history and amid the widest diversities of national conditions and customs, the pendulum has swung frequently between emphasis upon the local and upon the oecumenical aspects of the episcopal office. Essentially these aspects are complementary; and it is only for purposes of convenience that it is permissible to consider the episcopate from each several standpoint in order to study the English tradition of their respective importance.

I.

At the outset it is evident that the office and work of a bishop embrace as a primary end the oversight of the diocese committed to his care. Nor may any doubt be entertained in the modern age

[1] *Life of Mandell Creighton*, ii, 81.

of the industry and efficiency of the episcopate in the discharge of this branch of duty, which is considered as primary. 'By far the greater part of his time,' observes the Bishop of Winchester of the twentieth century bishop, 'is spent in his diocese. In the last century a complete change came over the relationship of a bishop to his diocese. A long series of political appointments had almost obliterated the ideal of the bishop as a Father-in-God . . . Since Wilberforce's day clergy and laity alike expect their bishop to be first and foremost a Father-in-God with a strong pastoral sense of his obligations towards his diocese.'[2] In estimating the importance of this changed conception of the episcopal office, account should be taken of those modern methods of transport and travel which have been the chief factor in permitting the realization of the ideal of the bishop as primarily a diocesan governor. 'It is probable,' as a wise and erudite historian admonishes us, 'that we often allow too little weight to economic considerations in our judgment of medieval conditions and medieval persons'[3]; and in many important respects in relation to episcopal standards of duty, the Middle Ages lasted until Macadam, the railway age, and the Victorian multiplication of English dioceses. When the twenty-six dioceses of the provinces of Canterbury and York at the accession of William IV are contrasted with the forty-three of the present day, and when the influence of the railroad and the motor-car together with the progressive improvement in the construction of roads are taken into consideration, it is evident that external conditions of transport have played a much larger part than internal developments of the pastoral ideal in modifying the practice of episcopal administration in England. In no epoch previous to the last hundred years have bishops in England enjoyed such means of regularity in ordinations, confirmations, visitations, and intercourse with their clergy. The importance of the economic factor is illustrated by the circumstance that, despite the possession of the same high ideals of pastoral duty, many bishops of the several provinces of the Anglican communion overseas are hindered from their fulfilment by similar problems

[2] C. F. Garbett, *The Anglican Communion: England*; in *Episcopacy Ancient and Modern* (ed. C. Jenkins and K. D. Mackenzie), pp. 97, 98-99.

[3] C. Jenkins, *The Medieval Bishop*, in *op. cit.*, p. 79.

of extent of territory and difficulties of transport to those which faced the English episcopate before the mid-nineteenth century. In England, however, the pastoral standard achieved by the episcopate is admittedly high; and this is a matter for legitimate pride. Ordinations are regular and frequent, varying from two to four general ordinations each year; the confimation tours of the bishops are extensive and almost continuous during the autumn, winter, and spring months; institutions are almost invariably performed in person instead of by proxy; and the personal intercourse between bishop and inferior clergy is close and regular. Furthermore, within the internal administration of the episcopal economy, better methods have been introduced and almost universally accepted in regard to the conduct of ordinations and confirmations; so that if Gilbert Burnet were to contemplate to-day the busy and decorous activities of the contemporary episcopate he would see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; though he might even be moved to reaffirm his expressed hope for a future when 'archdeacons, with many other burdens that lie heavy on the clergy, shall be taken away.'

Next to the increased regularity and frequency of episcopal confirmation, ordination, and of intercourse between bishops and clergy, perhaps the most outstanding characteristic of modern episcopal administration is the replacement of the judicial by the pastoral method. 'In early times,' observed Creighton nearly forty years ago, 'great difficulties beset the Church of England because the bishops were regarded as policemen. A bishop has two jurisdictions, the paternal and the judicial, but his judicial functions are distinctly second to his paternal.'[4] Throughout his episcopate Creighton endeavoured to set forward in practice the realization of his ideal of a paternal government; and during the intervening generation since his lamented death, that ideal has won increasing acceptance, so that the present Bishop of Winchester is persuaded that 'of all ways which make for discipline' that of godly admonition 'is both the mildest and at the same time most effective.'[5] In part this change is due to a real modification in the conception of the relationship of prelate to clergy and to the growing conviction (which lay at

[4] *Life of Mandell Creighton*, ii, 294.

[5] C. F. Garbett in *Episcopacy Ancient and Modern*, p. 109.

the basis of Creighton's entire episcopate) that methods of coercion are inimical to the *ethos* of Christian procedure; but in part also it is due to the complex of difficulties in regard to the action of ecclesiastical courts in relation to ceremonial disputes during the last hundred years, a topic which is to form the subject of a separate paper at this conference. Typical of the episcopal desire to proceed by persuasion and sweet reasonableness in the province of discipline is the revival of synods wherein the bishop takes counsel with, and sometimes from, the assembled clergy; whilst the Diocesan Conference now established in every English diocese supplies a further organ of consultation which has the advantage of a representation of the laity. Into details of episcopal administration, both pastoral and judicial, it would be an impertinence for one of the inferior clergy to presume to enter; moreover, in the essay of the Bishop of Winchester previously quoted a succinct and illuminating account of the practical fulfilment of the office and work of a bishop in England is afforded for all who care to read. Nor would it be possible to present a better summary of the modern ideal of the episcopal office than that which concludes his survey of the several aspects of its operation:

> 'In three directions the changes have been most significant. The ideal of the bishop as Father-in-God who knows and cares for his flock, who moves freely among his clergy and parishes, has taken the place of the once common conception of the bishop as a prelate who lived in remote dignity in his palace or castle. . . . Secondly, the bishops are in process of losing much of their monarchical authority and independence, for on the one hand they act much more frequently with one another as members of a college, while on the other in their dioceses in synod and diocesan conference they confer with their clergy and laity; a more constitutional idea of episcopacy is gradually being realized. But thirdly, while the bishops have lost some of the authority they used to derive from the temporal dignity of their position, they are now relying much more on the spiritual resources of their order.'[6]

II.

Side by side with the vast increase of diocesan activity undertaken by the contemporary episcopate, there has developed a growing dislike of the extra-diocesan duties and responsibility necessarily incumbent upon every bishop in his wider situation as a member of the body-corporate of the Church. Despite the subdivision and multiplication of dioceses, and despite the

[6] C. F. Garbett, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

ability of the motor-car to annihilate once formidable distances, the complaint of the episcopate is the dual one of pressure of business and of the amount of time required by the central obligations of their office. 'The total number of days spent in London for these central purposes,' observes the Bishop of Winchester of his brethren, 'takes them away from their dioceses for several weeks each year. Over-centralization of work is becoming a real danger. Every year tends to make more demands on the bishops' time for meetings in London."[7] It can hardly be doubted that this criticism embodies a conception of the relative importance of the several aspects of the episcopal office strikingly at variance with the historic English tradition; and it is at least open to question whether it does not express a limitation of outlook detrimental to the widest and deepest interests of the Church itself. Such at least was the emphatic and reiterated conviction of Archbishop Benson; and the reader of his biography is startled sometimes by the vigour and recurrence of his complaint of the failure of the majority of his brethren to realize the broader responsibilities of their position. 'The Bishops of England will soon be a name without a meaning. They are bishops of dioceses, and make an immense fuss about their business and their letters so that people groan over their lamentations about their work — they are good diocesan bishops, but bishops of England, no!'[8] To Dr. Randall Davidson, then Dean of Windsor and afterwards in turn Archbishop of Canterbury, Benson indulged in an almost splenetic outburst: 'I despair of prelacy; it recks nothing of the nation or mankind. Diocesan episcopacy will be reduced to the level of diocesan inspectorship. S. Wilberforce will be the execration of the Church of the future for two things: (i) the shortened service, (ii) the "new type" of bishop. But he had far too much sense to be himself the "new type." His crime was the misleading of his weak little brothers.'[9] Nor did his sentiments weaken with the passage of time. Upon another occasion he denounced the bishops as 'utterly parochially minded; and church openings and confirmations ("important diocesan engagements") are

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[8] *Life of E. W. Benson*, by A. C. Benson, ii, 260 (22 June, 1889).
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 203 (12 March, 1888).

alleged as reasons for non-attendance at anything imperial. This is the result of Bishop Wilberforce's ideal worked out in a way to which he never would have assented; and of the rule which excludes every bishop for four or five years, the *primitiae* of his episcopate, from the House of Lords. To a bishop of the younger sort the diocese is much more than the Church, and they cannot wonder that to the clergy the parish becomes much more than the diocese.'[10] In the *Life* of Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury is printed a private letter from Benson, administering a vigorous rebuke when that prelate at the outset of his episcopate ventured to place diocesan engagements before a bishops' meeting at Lambeth, 'very sad indeed and fraught with evil omens'; for 'if the bishops set aside these solemn Church engagements for diocesan ones, there is no wonder that the Church is lacking in corporate life, and that the parishes follow the example of the diocesans and live for themselves.'[11]

Bishop Westcott in a posthumous tribute summarized Benson's attitude aptly:

> 'From the first Archbishop Benson formed the loftiest idea of episcopal work. After he was transferred to Lambeth he constantly lamented the increasing pressure of local work on the time and thoughts of bishops; they were becoming, he thought, ministers of a diocese and not of the Church. "Diocesanism," he said, "is a new force of dissent, as virulent as Congregationalism—and more." "If every shepherd is to tell his own tale alone, we shall be cut off in detail." For himself, he recognized to the full the claims of the English Church and of the English nation upon the fullest exercise of his mature judgment.'[12]

Behind this conception of the office and work of a bishop there lies a long process of historical evolution, to which attention must be turned before passing to consider the contemporary situation. Of the influence of geographical factors upon the historical development of institutions, no better example could be drawn than that of the English episcopal system. From their foundation English dioceses have been few in number and large in extent; a characteristic differing widely from the innumerable small bishoprics of Christian antiquity along both sides of the Mediterranean littoral, but shared in common with a series of great dioceses stretching in the past from Syria to Constantinople, thence to the head of the Adriatic, along the Danube to the northern frontiers of the Roman Empire, in the plain of

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 521 (16 March, 1893).
[11] *Life of John Wordsworth*, by E. W. Watson, p. 165.
[12] *Life of E. W. Benson*, ii, p. 697.

Lombardy at Milan and Verona, and in Gaul and Spain. The type of large and extensive diocese is equally primitive with the city-bishopric; but its development in England, as in other countries, has affected profoundly the character of the resultant episcopate. The English episcopate has been noted always for its close and intimate participation in the affairs of the nation; and when the many centuries in which this share in national business was immediate and direct passed away, they left the continuing tradition of an episcopate composed of prelates learned and sufficient to become leaders in the several branches of duty which concerned the welfare both of Church and State.

It is this tradition of leadership which Benson was at pains to emphasize and which he desired to perpetuate. It is implicit in the admonition addressed by Dr. Davidson to Bishop Wilkinson of Truro that 'a bishop's position in the Church of England to-day is not a local one';[13] and it represents the principle upon which he acted throughout the twenty-five years of his own primacy, alike in the central councils of the Church and in the House of Lords. The biographer of Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury records that he 'certainly regarded an English diocesan bishop as a figure equally conspicuous with a Cabinet Minister, and would express surprise and sorrow when a layman, or even a schoolboy, was ignorant of the name of one among the less prominent members of his order.'[14] Historically, moreover, the independence and prominence of the episcopate has shown a remarkable correspondence with the dignity and importance of the see; and it would be almost a safe generalization to affirm that the influence of the English episcopate has been conditioned by the fewness and dignity of English dioceses. Nor does Church history lack abundance of precedents to indicate that the existence of a large number of small and insignificant sees has acted adversely upon the authority and dignity of their occupants, both in regard to the personal eminence of the individuals occupying them and in respect of the status of the bishoprics themselves.

> 'In the great age of theological controversy the contrast is extraordinary between the stability and statesmanship of those bishops who had great sees and those who had small ones. The latter, we may say

[13] *Life of Bishop Wilkinson*, ii, 4.
[14] *Life of Bishop John Wordsworth*, p. 165.

> generally were unworthy of their office; it was from their regions that the trouble sprang. They had not the ballast of a great position, with the grave sense of responsibility which it might have imparted.' [15]

The lesson of the conciliar period of Church history, that 'the multitude of insignificant bishops, easily led or misled, was a disaster to the Church,' has been reproduced throughout the history of the conciliar assemblies of the Roman Church, down to the latest, that of the Vatican; at which Italy with its more than 250 sees exercised an overwhelming preponderance over the nineteen bishops from the territories of the German Empire (as established in 1871 and excluding Austria and Hungary). Indeed, since the endeavour of the Council of Constance by its experiment of voting by nations to prevent the determination of decisions through the host of Italian prelates, no solution has been found of this perennial problem. In the Gallican Church after Napoleon's reorganization of dioceses and Concordat with the Papacy, the same vice of mediocrity came to distinguish the episcopate; so that when Mr. Bodley first went to live in France, Cardinal Manning, in presenting him with letters of introduction to the French bishops, observed:

> 'with that caustic humour which added a zest to his intimate conversation, "I fear that you will find the majority of my brethren of the French episcopate chiefly remarkable for their goodness." The cardinal's intellectual scorn was not quite justified. It is, however, true that the French bishops have not been chosen primarily for their learning or their eloquence. The chief quality . . . sought for in its bishops is that they should be able administrators.' [16]

The English tradition by its emphasis upon the dignity and importance of the bishop's position as a leader of the Church has invested the formal episcopal utterances upon such occasions as visitations with a public character which has in turn evoked a series of deliberate and considered pronouncements worthy of their occasion. No diligent reader of the leading episcopal charges of the last century, of which those of Bishop Thirlwall may be taken as typical, can doubt the profit of their perusal by a wider public than the diocesan clergy and laity who first heard them. Nor may any student of the formal addresses of Creighton, collected in the volume *The Church and the Nation*, hesitate to subscribe to the soundness of that conception

[15] E. W. Watson, *The Continuity of the Church of England*, in *The Church of England* (ed. W. R. Matthews), p. 29.

[16] J. E. C. Bodley, *The Church in France*, pp. 83-4 (1906).

of the episcopal office which produced them. More recently the archiepiscopal charge of Dr. Davidson, *The Character and Call of the Church of England*, and the episcopal charge of the Bishop of Gloucester, *The Church of England*, have given happy evidence of the continuation of that tradition amongst us; and it is urgently to be desired that it may be maintained, so that episcopal charges may be composed with a view to ultimate publication, and therefore embrace a variety of topics exceeding the range of diocesan interests and expounding the bishop's teaching upon matters of theology, history and church order affecting the entire Church of England.

In addition to such opportunities of public pronouncement, other normal occasions arise for the exercise of episcopal deliberation and wisdom. The constant need of the Primate for counsel and expert advice is an evident and growing problem of the Anglican Communion, with its extension at home and abroad. The need was pressed by Benson, and was felt with equal, if not greater, force by Davidson. Furthermore, committees of Convocation and the several commissions established from time to time by the Church Assembly, dealing with the most vital problems (such as those of Church and State, or marriage and divorce), emphasize the need for episcopal counsellors able both to lead and to speak with the authority born of careful investigation of the subject. And behind all the domestic activities of the Church in England stand the decennial Lambeth Conferences, where similar gifts and talents are required; for even the most cursory perusal of the reports of the two most recent assemblies of 1920 and 1930 can leave no doubt of the profundity and importance of the matters therein treated. Such considerations indicate the necessity to recover the older ideal of the English bishop as a leader in the wider counsels of the Church, which is in grave danger of being overlaid by the insistence upon absorption in diocesan administration and by the elevation of local interests above larger.

> 'I don't think,' observed Archbishop Benson to Westcott, 'I am mistaken as to the magnitude and increase of duty and labour for the episcopate; but more and more none will enter (except the Bishop of London [Temple], who is overwhelmed) into the *great field* of the Church's work. Everyone is absorbed in his own vineyard, and does not look on it as a part. There must be some standing inner council.' [17]

[17] *Life of Benson*, ii, p. 126 (2 Dec., 1886).

III.

There remains for brief consideration the third aspect of the bishop's office, that of his relation to national affairs and the life of the people. In its widest extent this aspect has found apt expression in Creighton's observation to Scott Holland :

> 'Now I feel the truth of your warning not to rest satisfied with the drudgery of my office. I have a strong feeling that a bishop ought not to be merely an ecclesiastical official, but a link between various classes and various activities. He ought to try to make all sorts of things converge, so that the standard and efficiency of each is heightened.' [18]

The earnest endeavours which Creighton made to translate precept into practice are writ large in his biography; and in this wider interpretation the contemporary episcopate is by no means lacking in either zeal or courage. The action of Archbishop Davidson during the General Strike is perhaps the most outstanding recent example of the assumption of a responsibility in civil affairs, all the more remarkable by reason of the known caution of the late Primate in embarking upon public action and his insistence upon the most careful and thorough exploration of the problem at issue beforehand. Other examples could be easily multiplied, and need not be enumerated. Moreover, whatever diversity of opinion may be entertained as to the prudence of any isolated episode or the part taken by any individual bishop, the cumulative impression testifies in no uncertain manner to the diligence and alertness of the episcopate to discharge its duty towards the nation in matters of social welfare, education, international relations, as well as the more specifically religious or moral issues.

Traditionally the means for such action of the English episcopate has been their situation as members of the House of Lords; but with the rapid multiplication of dioceses in the last hundred years the proportion of bishops outside the upper parliamentary house has increased steadily; and now only twenty-six of the forty-three archbishops and bishops are members. Inevitably this has led to the utilization of other agents of influence in political and social matters; but still the importance of a few bishops being enabled to pay regular and, if needful, frequent attendance in parliament is great. To Archbishop

[18] *Life of Creighton*, ii, pp. 201-2 (12 Nov., 1896).

Davidson this responsibility seemed one of the most important and influential of the privileges of his office; and during his episcopate at Winchester he explained to his clergy his view of the nature of the episcopal office in the legislative assembly.

> 'When questions directly affecting the affairs of the clergy, or the system of our Church schools, or the observance of Sunday, and so forth are under discussion, it is expected, as a matter of course, that the bishops should take an active part. But in my judgement they are not less truly called upon — especially while they have a place in the national legislature — to accept and use their responsibility in other matters which concern the social and moral health of our citizens and their children, say the protection of infant life from cruelty and wrong, or such amendment of our prison laws as shall make them remedial as well as punitive, or provision for the cases of workmen who are injured in the discharge of duty, or arrangements for promoting the health of shop-assistants. Bishops, in short, are entrusted, as I believe, with a place in the legislature not only for what are technically called ecclesiastical questions, but for whatever things directly concern the moral life and the social well-being of the English people.' [19]

The conviction of the late Primate of the geat importance of his position in the House of Lords was abundantly demonstrated by the assiduity of his attendance; and the continuance of this influence has been shown with equal force in the reign of his successor by the nomination of the present Archbishop of Canterbury to membership of the Joint Committee of both Houses to consider the problems of the government of India, and by his intervention in debates upon this and many other national and international questions. Nor should it pass without notice that the Bishop of Winchester, despite his deprecation of the calls to London which interfere so much with diocesan administration, has in practice constituted himself one of the foremost and best-informed speakers in the Upper House upon problems affecting the housing of the people and kindred topics. In all such cases the influence exercised by the episcopate in the legislature is both personal and official; official as testifying to the value still placed upon the presence of the bench in Parliament, and personal as evidence of the individual eminence and competence of the particular bishops enjoying the confidence of their peers upon the several issues of debate. It is imperative, therefore, that this tradition should be continued as a valuable element in the English tradition of the office and work of a bishop.

[19] R. T. Davidson, *Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester* (1899).

IV.

History is not static but dynamic; and institutions evolve and change with the varying conditions of successive centuries. It is not sufficient therefore to content oneself with a historical sketch or even analysis, such as it has been the intention of this paper to offer, of the English conception of the office and work of a bishop. Something must be said of the means by which it is conceived that the tradition may be continued and adapted to contemporary conditions. To attempt such a task may be temerarious. Nevertheless, the venture must be made in order to afford a basis of criticism for others. Historically, the English dioceses have been few and large; but now they are many and generally small. It is vain to suppose that they will return to their former paucity and extent; though it is not without purpose to urge that a halt be called at the present number, that any future changes be directed towards territorial readjustment between existing dioceses instead of the creation of new sees, and that as a general principle steps be taken to relieve the diocesan bishops of as much routine business as possible. Side by side with the growth of the diocesan conception of episcopacy there has proceeded a steady encroachment upon the independence of the parish clergy; and it may not be impertinent to suggest that a restoration of the relative independence of the parochial incumbents would ease the situation in regard to episcopal administration. Further, many duties which some bishops tend to assume personally might be committed to archdeacons, whilst an increase of suffragan-sees could certainly be used to relieve the admitted pressure upon certain diocesan bishops. By such means the movement of ideas might be directed again towards emphasis upon the wider as distinct from the local aspects of the episcopal office.

But granted even such modifications, the present number of dioceses may be expected to remain constant, and many bishops to be occupied primarily in diocesan administration. In such case the most hopeful line of solution may seem to lie in the creation of an inner council of a few bishops whose primary concern will lie with the central affairs of the Church of England and of the Anglican Communion. Such a solution was implicitly

advocated by Benson in his suggestion to Westcott of 'a standing inner council'; and more explicitly in an account which he set down of a discussion with Lightfoot and Westcott:

> 'We discussed the unfortunate result in one most important matter of the happy change in episcopal activity. The diocesan energies interfere with every bishops' meeting or meeting of Convocation, and leave the Church almost destitute of the opportunity of counsel. . . . We came to the conclusion that a Cardinalate in some form was becoming absolutely necessary. What we thought might be done was the appointment of four or five bishops to give at least an annual fortnight of conference, with nothing else to do, on matters proposed by the archbishop or otherwise found necessary.'[20]

Other considerations support this conclusion. A council of forty-three bishops is evidently not well adapted for efficient deliberation and decision, but rather needs the evolution of an inner cabinet. Such a cabinet might comprise, in addition to the two archbishops, the three bishops whose sees carry by virtue of their dignity a seat in the House of Lords, London, Durham, and Winchester, an expedient which would carry the additional advantage of giving a fair representation to the Province of York. Also since in any possible reform of the House of Lords a severe reduction of the number of episcopal members would seem almost certain, the episcopal cabinet might include all those bishops, say six, who were still members of parliament. Such an inner council would be composed of bishops whose duty would be to give primary place to their responsibilities as central counsellors of the Church, and whose diocesan administration would be carried out largely by delegation and devolution of authority. They would form a standing council with which the Archbishop of Canterbury could consult, which could devote itself to the obtaining and eludication of expert opinion, and which would be the body which in the first instance would formulate also public pronouncements to be made in the name of the corporate episcopate.

If such a project were essayed, it would involve of course the selection of particularly qualified individuals to occupy the sees associated with this cabinet council. Nor may any doubt be entertained of the necessity upon other grounds of the careful placing upon the bench of an element so qualified for leadership and the forming of opinion. In a letter of congratulation to

[20] *Life of Benson*, ii, 130 (19 June, 1887).

Stubbs upon his elevation to the episcopate Creighton described the kind of bishop needed for the office of counsellor.

> 'I must say this, that for the sake of the Church I think it is the very best thing that has happened for many years. Frankly, I have been somewhat alarmed lately at the thought of the want of *wisdom* in the bench. There is zeal, earnestness, practical ability, eloquence enough, but—wisdom? I think that your accession to the bench will bring strength exactly where it is needed. Your large knowledge of everything connected with the history, position and principles of the Church will be of incalculable usefulness.' [21]

In the subsequent episcopate of Creighton himself a practical demonstration was given of the translation of the precepts of this letter into action. For Creighton came very near to the realization of the ideal of a counsellor-bishop, fulfilling his duty towards the wider interests of the Church, fruitful in wise counsel, and singularly able to express with vigour, lucidity, and conviction the fundamental principles which underlay his administrative policy. He himself acknowledged the secret of his action. 'The accumulation of knowledge is drudgery; but acting upon knowledge and experience already gained requires no effort';[22]; and again he wrote, 'I thought that nowadays there was plenty of zeal and plenty of practical capacity applied to the work of the Church; on the other hand, I scarcely think there is enough learning.'[23] No reader of his writings nor of his biography can cease to lament the untimely death which removed so sage a prelate from the capital city and from the central councils of the Church; for it is not too sanguine a view to entertain that if his years had been prolonged as were those of Archbishop Davidson — and both were consecrated to the episcopate on the same day — together they might have saved the Church of England from the unhappy *débâcle* of the Prayer Book revision controversy, so sure was Creighton's grasp of fundamental principles and so wise the late primate's judgment of their practical application.

To this establishment of an episcopal cabinet there should be added a *Curia Anglicana*, a body of clergy scattered throughout the two provinces of Canterbury and York whose primary duties should be those of study and exploration in order to give expert opinion in the several departments of theology, church

[21] *Life of Creighton*, ii, 489-90 (1884).
[22] *Ibid.*, 489.
[23] *Ibid.*, 490.

history, ethics and kindred subjects. It is difficult, indeed, to see how the necessity for the creation of such an informal *curia* can be avoided. Few primates of the future are likely to have served so protracted an apprenticeship in the ways of Lambeth as it was the good fortune of Archbishop Davidson to experience as chaplain to Tait, friend and confidant of Benson, and as Primate for a quarter of a century. Further, evidence multiplies of the increasing volume and variety of business pressing upon the Archbishops of Canterbury from all the several branches of the Anglican Communion which requires the services of a body of experts. Archbishop Benson emphasized the desirability of such a *curia*, but at the same time lamented the disappearance of the sources whence it might have been supplied :

> 'The persons who could give the time do not now, since the suppression of canonries, exist in this country. To be good counsellors, people must be thoroughly familiar with all the subjects, and have time regularly to meet.' [24]

At this present juncture, when revised drafts of cathedral statutes are being almost everywhere drawn up and given legal enactment, it may be opportune, and not yet perhaps too late, to call attention to the imperative necessity of providing in such manner for the members of the advisory body desired by Benson and demanded by subsequent history. It would scarcely be too bold or immoderate to request that at least one canonry of each cathedral should by statute be set apart for the specialized study of some branch of sacred learning, the fruits of which should be at the service of the Church and directed according to the needs of the time. Such an informal body, a kind of scattered consultative commission mainly devoted to the several particular aspects of study and meeting regularly for the giving of counsel, would constitute not a rival but a complement to the standing inner council of bishops. Indeed, without this wider clerical body it is even doubtful if the episcopal cabinet could work most efficiently and well.

Such are mere suggestions for the detailed operation of the principles underlying the English tradition of the office and work of a bishop. The principles themselves are of abiding importance, however they may be translated into practical operation; and upon them attention should be concentrated, for they

[24] *Life of Benson*, ii, 126 (to Dean Davidson, 5 Jan., 1887).

are especially important at this juncture when increased emphasis must be placed upon the wider aspects of the bishop's position. In addition to the responsibilities of his diocesan situation, the English bishop, to quote the words of Archbishop Davidson in his charge to the clergy of the dioceses of Winchester,

> 'is, and not less rightly, expected to be giving time and thought to a whole multitude of central things in the life of the nation or the Church, things quite other than diocesan. Look back into any period you will of English history and see the part the bishops whose tombs surround you in this choir have always taken, as in duty bound, in such central matters as affected at the time the well-being, and especially the moral and religious well-being, of the English people. Unless I am strangely mistaken, it is not the wish of contemporary churchmen, whether lay or clerical, that their bishops should now for the first time in our history be so exclusively local officers as to have neither time nor opportunity for interests which are larger still.'

THE ENGLISH LAYMAN

By G. G. Coulton, D.Litt., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

I SPEAK from the unsacerdotal, not the anti-sacerdotal, point of view. Anti-clericalism is mainly a continental phenomenon. Harmony between laity and priesthood has been one of the great assets of the English Church, a harmony less dependent on authority than on liberty, and on frank expression of opinion from both sides. There is an excellent Italian proverb which runs : 'Clear understandings make long friendships.' We have never had a period in our history at which clergy and laity have not spoken plainly and temperately to each other.

I would begin by suggesting that Christianity is essentially an unsacerdotal religion : that there is no essential difference between the laity and the priesthood, whether we consider the question from the historical or the theological point of view. Historically, documents seem to show a movement with the slightest of priestly connexions in its origin. Many priests were in Israel in the days of our Lord, yet to none of them was He specifically sent; and His cousin John, the son of a priest, was never definitely inside the Christian Church. We may say with all reverence that our Founder was a layman, and that among His disciples we find Him making no distinction between layman and priest. On the contrary, the whole New Testament seems to emphasize their original lay and prophetic character in opposition to the priestly caste of their own nation.

It is advisedly that I couple those two words *lay* and *prophetic*, because Mr. J. A. Bramley, in a recent number of the *Modern Churchman*,[1] reminds us very opportunely of what is too often ignored or forgotten, the unsacerdotal status of the Hebrew Prophets. By far the most spiritual portion of the Old Testament was written by laymen. To the New Testament, no writer has contributed so much as St. Paul, whom we may regard as the typical lay preacher, the typical successor of the earlier prophets. The prophet is a man who speaks, not in virtue of his office, but in virtue of his personality and his individual inspira-

[1] May, 1935, p. 88.

tion; he is a personification of the principle of private judgment, a man responsible to no religious authority except that of the God Whose voice has come directly to his ear; 'the wind bloweth whither it listeth . . . so is every one that is born of the Spirit.'

Dr. Hort, in his book *The Christian Ecclesia*, traced clearly the eminently prophetic and unsacerdotal side of Christianity in its first generation. It was in Antioch that the disciples were first called Christians; that is, they were first recognized by outsiders as forming a definite organized community. Yet that community grew from within; it had not been planted as an official colony. As Hort writes:

> 'Here was a great capital, including a huge colony of Jews, in close relation with all the Greek-speaking world and all the Syriac-speaking world; and in its midst a multitude of Christian disciples had come into existence in the most casual and unpremeditated way. No Apostle had led or founded a mission; no Apostle had taught there' (p. 59).

This attracted the attention of the original nucleus of Christians at Jerusalem, who then sent Barnabas to preach to this community, and St. Barnabas brought in the newly-converted Paul. But, even in Jerusalem, the action was not taken by the Apostles alone, as definitely recognized officials whose decisions were independent and final. It was by 'the *ecclesia* which was at Jerusalem,' by the whole body of Christians who were there, that Barnabas was despatched on his mission to Antioch. Moreover, as Hort again points out (p. 55), 'the man who lays hands on St. Paul and baptizes him is no Apostle or even evangelist, but a simple disciple of Damascus, Ananias.' The late Professor Cuthbert Turner, whose sympathies were very strongly sacerdotal, summed up equally plainly on that point. He wrote:

> 'In effect the Church of the first age may almost be said to have consisted of a laity grouped in communities, and a ministry that moved about from place to place to do the work of missionaries to the heathen and of preachers and teachers to the community. Most of St. Paul's epistles to churches are addressed to the community, the holy people, the brethren, without any hint in the title of the existence of a local clergy; the Apostle and the Christian congregation are the two factors of primary account.'[1]

In the Apocalypse, all the privileges of the Jewish hierarchy are transferred to the rank and file of the Christian community:

> 'Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth' (v. 9-10).

[1] *Camb. Med. Hist.*, I, 144.

I need not dwell upon the steps by which the young community gradually crystallized into an organization with definite officers—bishops, elders or priests, deacons, and so forth. This was doubtless necessary: Christianity could never have become a world-religion without some such organization. But it is important to note how much of its original unsacerdotal character survived even when the very definite rule of bishops and priests had been established. Here, again, Professor Turner brings it out very clearly in the first volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History* (pp. 143 *ff*). St. Clement of Rome shows how no Christian minister was ordained in early times but by consent of the people; and in the case of the bishop, the laity not only consented, they actually elected. It was not till three hundred years after the Crucifixion that the clergy began to acquire a separate share in the choice of their bishop, and it was not till even later that they became the predominant party among the electors. 'It is the people in the first place which has the power both of electing worthy bishops and of spurning the unworthy.' As Professor Turner writes again:

> 'The people had originally chosen their bishop without serious possibility of interference from the clergy. . . . Cyprian, it is clear from his whole correspondence, was made bishop of Carthage by the laity against the decided wishes of his colleagues in the presbyterate. . . . And this was still the practice after the middle of the fourth century: the descriptoin of the election of St. Ambrose in 374 by his biographer mentions the people only. . . . Another biography, that of St. Martin of Tours by Sulpicius Severus, depicts a similar scene about the same date: Martin was elected, in the face of opposition from some of the assembled bishops, by the persistent vote of the people. The laity too, at least in some churches, still selected even the candidates for the priesthood' (p. 152).

But, gradually, congregations became too large for direct election of this kind to be possible without disorder and tumult. In 366, when the populace of Rome was divided between Damasus and Ursinus as candidates for the Papacy, one hundred and thirty-seven corpses were counted in the Liberian basilica at the end of the day.[2] That, of course, is a very extreme

[2] *Cam. Med. Hist.*, I, 173: 'The historian [Ammianus Marcellinus] grimly adds that the prize was one which candidates might naturally count it worth any effort to obtain, seeing that an ample revenue, showered on the Roman bishop by the piety of Roman ladies, enabled him to dress like a gentleman, to ride in his own carriage, and to give dinner-parties not less well-appointed than Caesar's.'

case; but the fact that St. Ambrose was elected by popular acclamation even before he had been baptized points to evident dangers in cases where the candidate was not one so universally respected as Ambrose for his learning and piety. Popular choice, therefore, gradually became too unwieldy: and, at the same time, the clergy were becoming sufficiently numerous to form a satisfactory body of electors. Thus the laity were gradually pushed aside, except where the State interfered in the appointment of bishops. In either case (as Professor Turner remarks) 'Christian feeling had to content itself with a grave deflection from primitive ideals' (p. 153). This elimination of the laity from the elections of their pastors was as significant in its way as the present state of things, where the laity count for so little in our national Church Assembly, whether through their own fault or through that of others, or by the natural force of circumstances.

As the Middle Ages wore on, the laity sank more and more into the background. Here, I think, the clerical predominance was certainly natural, correspondent to the actual state of society, and earned to a great extent by clerical merits. During the barbarian invasions, while the state officials and the local magistrates were swept away, the bishops and their clergy remained at their posts, and thus inherited much of the power of the absent officials. It was ecclesiastics, as a rule, who did all that was done for the upkeep of roads and bridges and hospitals and schools. They thus secured an absolute monopoly of school-teaching everywhere except in Italy, where the old imperial educational system was strong enough to hold something of its own. Therefore, when the tide of barbarism turned at last, and the Church began to convert the heathen tribes in masses, then these converts were taught to regard the priest not only as a spiritual guide but also to a great extent as a temporary ruler. 'Thou shalt pay thy tithes,' for instance, was a commandment practically on the same footing as 'Thou shalt not steal'; it was a law which the layman disobeyed not only at the risk of his soul but at his bodily peril also. Thus, to the very end of the Middle Ages, it was punishable to work on Sundays or any of the fifty red-letter Church festivals, or to shirk church-going, or to neglect that one yearly Communion, at Easter, which was demanded of every man. The interference of the later Puritans with what

we now regard as a man's private life was a survival from the Middle Ages. These Puritans were tactless and unsympathetic enough to revive the time-honoured prohibitions, and to enforce them now with severity, after centuries of steady boot-legging.

This priestly control naturally increased with the increasing political power of the Papacy. No less naturally, it tended to a mechanization of religion, which not only aroused active opposition from heretics, from men who were ready to declare war under the flag of liberty, or even of licence, but which also gave many of the orthodox a feeling, if only subconscious or unconscious, of oppressive restraint. You will find that even the orthodox reforms of the Middle Ages, of which the Franciscan was the most prominent, had all an unsacerdotal tinge—here, again, I must warn you, not anti-sacerdotal. And, meanwhile, the increase of Papal autocracy brought Rome fatally into collision with the simultaneously increasing power of the great States. After the great struggle between Papacy and Empire in the thirteenth century, the victorious Papacy had to reckon with the strongest of European sovereigns, King Philip IV of France. The result was a generation or more of wordy warfare, the Popes finding themselves no longer able to enlist efficient armies on their side. In that war of pamphlets there emerged more than one writer who knew enough of history to go back to the primitive Christian Church and to claim for the laity their ancient rights. By far the best known of these were the Italian professor Marsilius of Padua and the English Franciscan William of Ockham. Marsilius was doubtless inspired by the freer political traditions of the Italian city-republics; Ockham inherited some of the unsacerdotal traditions of St. Francis and his first disciples. Both insist upon the poison of priestly tyranny and the one essential remedy of recalling much of the ancient lay-control. Marsilius writes:

> 'Ecclesiastics, according to this truest and most proper signification of the word, are and should be called all Christ's faithful folk, priests and non-priests alike; for Christ bought and redeemed all with His blood. . . . Christ's blood was not shed for the Apostles alone. . . . Therefore it is not only those ministers—bishops or priests and deacons—who constitute that Church which is Christ's spouse; but they form only a part of this spouse.'[3]

[3] *Defensor Pacis.* Ed. Prerité-Orton, p. 117 (Dict. II, cap. ii).

So also Ockham:

> 'The Church of Christ is not the clergy only, but the multitude of the faithful, clergy and laity, men and women.'[4]

And he, like Marsilius, would subject the Pope to the jurisdiction of the whole mass of Christians in a General Council which (as he implies) should give votes even to women — a thing unheard of in those ages. For (argues the Master to the Pupil in that *Dialogue* in which Ockham deals with this question), after all, women as well as men have souls to save.[5] And, although the Councils of Constance and Bâle failed in their attempt to change the government of the Roman Church from despotic to constitutional, yet for some generations before the Reformation the laity had begun to claim, and to exert in practice, fragments of their original control over Church life. They took a more active part in controlling hospitals and schools; and, in great cities, they had the appointment of most of the chantry-priests. Moreover, they often kept the parish accounts and controlled the parish finances to an extent which surprises, and sometimes scandalizes, modern Roman Catholics who stumble across the medieval evidence. In modern Switzerland, on the other hand, a Roman Catholic priest tells me that there are three cantons in which the priest is even dependent upon the suffrages of his congregation: every five years the question of his retention is automatically put to the vote, and, in default of a favourable majority, his reign comes automatically to an end.

There, then, is a brief sketch of the layman's case from the historical point of view. From the theological, I will speak more briefly still. Ockham and, I think, Marsilius face the speculative possibility that true Christianity might die out from among the clergy and survive only among the laity—conceivably, 'in one single old woman,' writes Ockham with logical exaggeration. He and Marsilius, however, were audacious speculators, representing philosophic licence rather than ordinary thought. But on one supreme important point the laity have been granted a definite theological status, by practically universal consent, for fifteen centuries, from St. Augustine's time down to the present day. The layman or laywoman may administer what, at least

[4] *Octo Quaestiones*, I, c. xvii (Goldast, *Monarchia*, etc., ii, 333).

[5] *Dialogus*, c. lxxxv (Goldast, ii, 605).

from one point of view, is the most fundamental and important of all Church sacraments. We can illustrate this by taking the teaching of that Christian Church which clings most tenaciously to the sacerdotalist doctrine. Roman Catholicism holds that there is no entrance to heaven but through baptism. This baptism may, in certain cases, be mystical and invisible; but, normally, the formula of the Church must be pronounced and water sprinkled or poured, and the ministrant must do this with the intention of effecting a valid baptism. Only — and here is the important point for my argument — it is not in the least necessary that the ministrant should be a priest: the words, the water, and the intention are the only essentials. Not only may a woman be the ministrant, but even a non-Christian, provided that those three essentials be fulfilled. Let me put a hypothetical case — very improbable, no doubt, but far from impossible. In India, two children are born on the same day of two Christian mothers. Both children die within an hour of birth, the mothers being too ill to help in any way. One child goes to the grave unbaptized: but, in the other case, the Hindoo nurse has curiously watched previous baptisms; she knows that her mistress would desire one here; therefore of her own accord she pronounces the words and sprinkles the water, with the full intention of doing what the priest would have done if he had been there. By Roman Catholic doctrine to the present day, that child, dying at the moment it has been washed clean from all taint of original sin, will behold God face to face throughout all eternity, a bliss beyond all comparison greater than any other conceivable happiness. The other will lose all possibility of that Beatific Vision; and, though St. Thomas Aquinas has been followed by many in the Middle Ages, and by a still larger proportion to-day, in his argument that this does not preclude a certain natural happiness, yet we may doubt whether one medieval mother in a thousand would have assented in her inward heart to that argument; and certainly we have a testimony in the severity with which careless and defective baptism was judged, as leading to the loss of a priceless soul. Dante expresses the general feeling in his picture of the limbo of the unbaptized, where the air trembles eternally with the sighs of men, women and children who dwell there in sadness, but without torment, because they 'had not

baptism' and 'worshipped not God aright.' Concerning these, Virgil says to Dante, 'For such defects, and for no other fault, are we lost; and only in so far afflicted, that without hope we live in desire.'[6] Boccaccio, the first of Dante's great commentators, is on the whole even less favourable to their happiness. All this must be understood and borne in mind if we would realize the significance of the layman's, and even the pagan's, power of baptism. For here we have what may reasonably be called the most important of Christian sacraments — far more directly necessary to salvation, according to all these centuries of theological thought, than even the Eucharist, since none ever dreamed of imagining a limbo for souls who lose the Beatific Vision through defect of ever having tasted or seen the consecrated Host. Baptism, 'the Portal of Heaven,' as Dante calls it, needs no priest to unlock it.

This is enough on the side of the layman's privileges: let us now consider briefly his corresponding duties. Let us begin with the frank recognition that, if time has tended to exalt the priest and to depress the layman in most Churches, this is in great part the layman's own fault. If the Roman and the Romanizing clergy magnify their own right to teach and the layman's duty of obedience, that is so partly, at least, because the layman does not know his Bible with that thoroughness which provides the surest touchstone for distinguishing between earliest Christianity and later traditions. If the word *Mass* is becoming increasingly common among us, that is partly because the laity suffer it patiently, not having taken sufficient interest in Church history to realize that *Mass* was originally rather a vulgar and meaningless term, which, arising in the ages when neither society nor religion was at a high level, gradually drove out the really expressive and original Christian terms of *Eucharist*, or *Lord's Supper*, or *Breaking of Bread*. If, again, the Church services are becoming less and less congregational in the true sense; if attendance at the Eucharist is treated as an *opus operatum*, to use the medieval term — as an act which produces much of its effect independently of real attention on the worshipper's part—that idea, again, could never have grown up in thoroughly healthy congregations. And, lastly, if bureau-

[6] *Inferno*, iv, 25 *ff*.

cracy reigns in some parishes, and all activities are by exaggeration centralized in the rectory or vicarage, that would have been impossible in the days of early Christian enthusiasm, when the layman as well as the priest lay under daily danger of sealing his faith with his blood.

Those days are past recall; and I suppose nobody would wish to recall them just as they were. But we must all wish to do something towards diminishing the gulf between clergy and laity. It has often been suggested that the healthiest Church, under modern conditions, would be one in which the clergy had begun their career, at least, by living as St. Paul lived at Corinth; in which no man should be ordained before forty; and in which, even then, in all but the greater parishes, he might continue his former bread-work side by side with his duties as liturgical leader and spiritual adviser of his people. But, without any such radical change as this, we might fairly hope to see a movement in this direction, through increased decentralization of spiritual and social activities in our villages and towns. Yet, if the clergy are to make more use of laymen and laywomen as helpers, the laity must certainly show themselves willing and competent on their side. And, to begin with, every home in Britain can be a distinctively Christian home quite apart from parochial activities. The young clergy no longer come so preponderantly as of old from either clerical or quietly well-to-do families, in which the practice of family prayer survives, if only in tradition. Many are ordained now from a much poorer or less settled environment. This has certainly its good side; the older generation was too conservative and easy-going. But it has also its danger, in widening that gulf between clergy and laity: the newly-ordained curate feels himself to have taken a more definite step, and is proportionately more tempted to magnify his office, than if he came from a family where morning prayers were as much a matter of course as they were a century ago. I would venture to suggest that the clearest and most fruitful step towards further rehabilitation of the laity in the Church would be this reinstatement of family prayer. It demands, after all, nothing more than a week-day recognition of what we all recognize for Sundays. A man lays no claim to superior piety by reading a short psalm or a few verses from the New Testa-

ment, and kneeling down to the morning collect and the Lord's prayer and the grace, than by going to church. Differences on this point are so much a matter of course nowadays, that there would be no awkwardness in the understanding that guests or servants or older children are perfectly free to stay away. Few things, I feel, would contribute more than this practice to lessen that religious gulf between Sunday and weekday which runs parallel to the gulf between clergy and laity. Moreover, it would enable the priest to neglect with a good conscience, in many cases, one of those obsolete rubrics which hamper modern Anglican life, whether from the Anglo-Catholic or the Modernist point of view. He might well spare himself from reciting matins in an empty or nearly-empty church, when he knew that there was in his flock a real habit of morning prayer; and the time and energy thus saved might be spent in solid reading which would keep him more in touch with the modern laity. This would be possible even under the present unfortunate conditions of dear books and narrow clerical incomes, for, in a populous parish, there would be laymen who would possess and would gladly lend such books; in a comparatively bookless village, on the other hand, there is comparatively little call for the priest to get far beyond his flock. I venture, therefore, to close with the suggestion that it might help to solve a good many present-day problems if incumbents would, each in his own parish, encourage the laity to start an unostentatious but practical League of Family Prayer.

THE TRAINING OF THE CLERGY

By the Reverend J. S. Bezzant, B.D., M.A., Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of Liverpool Cathedral.

THE treatment of this subject, to be relevant and practical, must have regard to the purposes in view in training the clergy, to the men available for training, and to the world in which they are eventually to exercise their office and ministry. Clergymen may, of course, be regarded first and foremost as sacrificing priests, charged to impress upon men and women, as the first duty of life, frequent attendance upon the sacrifice; as a body of men who are to teach, with a maximum of definiteness, simplicity and assurance, a scheme of unalterable doctrines and consequent practices, backed by a great institution whose alleged divine authority is the sufficient if not the sole ground of what is taught in its name, and whose immense influence and power will always support the individual priest, provided only he be loyal. Clergymen, so regarded, in fact claim control, in the name of heaven, of the lives and minds of other people. Clearly the type of training, and no less the type of man, appropriate and requisite to the maintenance of that ideal will be vastly different from such as are appropriate and requisite to the maintenance of the ministry of the historic Church of England, desirous of retaining her identity, character and influence in the modern world. Our Church is not concerned to secure the dependence of her members upon the clergy, nor to produce a certain type of pietistic religion. If she recognizes a distinction between the sacred and the secular she does not admit any separation between their spheres. She has no business to foster a special English brand of Christianity; but it is her paramount duty to bring the spirit, principles and doctrines of Christianity, and the practice consequent upon them, effectively into the lives of the people of our land. This she will never do except in one way—by winning the free allegiance of our people to them. This indicates the purpose which should dominate the training of her clergy.

From this point of view, and looking forward, the whole question of clerical training seems to me serious, even grave. There is much lay criticism of the men turned out by our theological colleges which might be softened if the critics saw the men who leave the colleges as they are when they go in; and abatement of lay criticism might even extend to sympathy if the many rejected candidates were also seen; while an obvious reason for the poor quality of so many ordinands is that they must needs be recruited from the faithful laity. On the other hand, this criticism is counterbalanced by the frequent assertion that there is no shortage of candidates of excellent quality, but that what is lacking is the money wherewith to train them. I wish I could believe the first part of this assertion to be true. One man's experience is necessarily very limited, and I should wish on that account to qualify (perhaps seriously) what I say. During nearly ten years' teaching at Oxford I have known several first-class ordination candidates, and I am not thinking only of those who were so accounted in the examination schools; but I must confess that, judging from those selected by diocesan and central church authorities for financial assistance, the alleged abundance of candidates of excellent quality has not brought its existence to my eager notice. Nor have I come across it during nearly three years in a northern diocese in which all the ordinands, from forty to fifty a year, at one stage or another become known to me. It is my duty to interview dozens of young men, in the early twenties, aspirants to Orders, who apply from the parishes to the diocese for provisional acceptance and financial assistance. Few of them have had more than a primary school education, or have read anything since, or give any impression of being interested in or even aware of important contemporary events in the world. Their qualifications, actual or potential, beyond a sincere desire to serve and some experience in what is called church work, are far to seek. When I observe the young men entering the professions I am seldom moved to make comparisons favourable to those entering the ministry of the Church. Within a generation our Church has found herself obliged to provide the funds for the training of the great majority of her clergy. The Roman Catholic and the Free Churches have always accepted this responsibility: with us it is a new one.

Our ministry is no longer filled by men of one social class formerly regarded as superior; indeed the question is whether the change in this respect has not been too rapid and too complete, whether this change in itself is not significant and serious. It is an important question, as the Bishop of Gloucester wrote in an appended note to a Report on this matter which largely ignored the point, why a large number of persons who have a certain amount of private means and therefore are, to a certain extent, independent of the financial position, used to take Orders and do not do so now. The Bishop gave the true reasons for this change: the upshot of them all was that Christianity and the work of the ministry had largely lost their influence and attractiveness for the persons in mind and for the circles in which they live and move.

A couple of generations ago the overwhelming majority of clergymen were educated in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, in which environment they had taken a degree and read a modicum of theology. To-day a large percentage of ordinands have not studied at any university: the theological training of these, and of all but a fraction of university candidates, is undertaken by some twenty theological colleges, of which about a third have some connection with or are in proximity to universities. It is often pointed out that the examination standard required of ordinands to-day is considerably higher than it was two generations ago. That is no doubt true; but, set in the context of relevant circumstances, it is of little significance. For the circumstances have greatly changed both in difficulty and complexity, and in ways to which the nature of clerical training and the standard of ordination examinations bear no adequate correspondence. If the theological equipment of the clergy of a former age was slight, so were the demands made upon it. The clergy ministered in a country where, except in a few circles with which they seldom or never came in contact, Christianity was at least passively taken for granted and accepted. If there were those who questioned or set aside the more speculative Christian doctrines, hardly any questioned the Christian moral standard or doubted that the main body of ethical judgments built up under the influence of Christian teaching was highest and best. The alleged inconsistencies

between the knowledge of the sciences and the teachings of theology did not much affect the ministry of the parish priest, while Biblical exposition and exegesis were covered and governed by the convenient canon that no one passage of Scripture should be expounded so as to be repugnant to another: the meaning of the Scriptures ascertained, there was little question of its authority.

To-day all is changed. The world in which the clergy work is a very different world, and the Christian faith itself has become much more difficult to teach in a way to which the world will listen and by which it will be impressed. The main outline of Christian doctrine is by no means taken for granted or even generally known. Christian moral standards (or what are represented as such) are criticized and set aside as out of date. It is no doubt true that much scientific knowledge has no bearing whatever upon Christian doctrine; but the scientific temper, and still more the widespread pseudo-scientific temper, feels itself to be acutely at variance with the mental attitudes alleged to be required and encouraged by the Church. The world-view proper to our age and that which underlies all we say and sing and hear in church seem to be in little relation except one of manifest conflict: as someone observed to me, 'the two do not scale together.' To this is joined a vague sense that 'the Bible has been proved untrue' or that somehow it is no longer to be relied upon; while such of the clergy as have a superficial acquaintance with Biblical criticism, especially that of the New Testament, find that its most obvious effect upon them is that they can no longer preach and teach from the Bible with the old confidence. It is true that all this changed feeling is seldom the outcome of much rational reflection or logical demonstration. But that is not to the point. The prevailing temper of mind is no less real because it is produced by constant suggestion and not by conclusive argument. After all, the condition of mind of most of us in regard to our ultimate beliefs and values is one of psychological certitude rather than of rational certainty.

Amid this confusion there is a kindred factor of much importance. Education or half-education is becoming universal, even if, like the river Dee, it becomes shallower as it widens. The prevailing atmosphere of the modern world greatly encourages

the educated and the half-educated in that questioning of everything, except their own competence, to which they are always prone. Religious, moral, political and social ideas, and all authorities and institutions, are challenged and opposed by others: they are challenged fervently and by arguments, and the opposing ideas and ideals are advanced and supported by arguments. They may be bad arguments, but the point is that they are arguments. Religious ideas and doctrines, with all that follows from them, are peculiarly open to attack by such argumentation. It will not be answered, overcome, or displaced to any appreciable extent either by increased efficiency in ecclesiastical organization or by piety and devoted service in individual Christian lives. Excellence in these qualities is not regarded as proof of the beliefs associated with them: it may be looked upon as evidence of remoteness from the realities of life and as the sincerity of the completely misguided. People of the type and outlook we have in mind neither attend church nor seek the ministrations of the clergy in other ways, but if the Church of England is not to become a sect ministering to a small and not influential element in the national life, she must be able to influence and convert these questioners and rebels. This she will not do with any hope of permanence unless her clergymen can show that the ideas and beliefs upon which Christian life and standards rest are more capable of defence, are more true, than the ideas and ideals opposed to them.

The first and most pressing conclusion which emerges from the background of our subject is this. The theological colleges, apart from their university connections where any exist, are plainly quite inadequate for the task which has been increasingly laid upon them. That task is nothing less than the complete theological training, as well as the pastoral and devotional training, of all but a fraction of ordinands. Criticisms of these colleges are as unfair as they are frequent, being in large part compounded of ignorance, and a lack of understanding of and sympathy with the hard and devoted efforts of the staffs of these institutions to carry and discharge a burden of responsibility altogether too heavy and too exacting for their resources. No doubt some of the colleges are better than others. Some may tend to turn out narrow partisans of one or another ecclesiastical

type, of whom the partisan Modernist perhaps does the most harm. When this happens it is mainly due to the fact that the candidates are already of those types when they enter the colleges, and to their capacity to remain impervious to any but congenial influences. Certainly in the college in which I studied and afterwards taught, the efforts of the staff were far less directed to making 'good Modernists' than to bringing the opinions, at least of the abler men, within any limits likely to prove acceptable to the ordaining Bishops. I have sometimes been surprised at the extent of our success in this way.

Now what happens in most theological colleges is this. Only a tiny fraction of the students have the slightest previous acquaintance with either theology or philosophy. For the most part they are hard pressed financially and are anxious to 'qualify' in the shortest possible time. In two years, and often less, they have to pass the two parts of the General Ordination Examination, now required by Bishops as a certificate of theological competence. And in this field miracles still happen. The syllabus includes the study of the whole Scriptures, Christian doctrine, including the history of it, Church history, Christian morals and Christian worship. It is exceptional to find a student with any real knowledge of Greek at the beginning of this immense course of study.[1] This means that students must often devote as much as a third of their whole time in the college to the business of acquiring a smattering of that language. 'Education,' in such conditions, resolves itself into a hasty and superficial cramming, a race against time, deadening to the student and both deadening and repellent to any scholarly teacher. Except for an ill-digested and therefore easily forgotten amount of disjointed information, the student emerges from such a college no more an educated person than when he went in. But it will be seen that even if the staffs of theological colleges desired to manufacture partisans, they lack opportunity.

It is obvious that men trained in such a fashion are pathetically ill-equipped to expound the Christian faith intelligently and to defend its intellectual foundations; often they do not even know where the root difficulties lie or what the real problems are. They go into parishes and work with praiseworthy

[1] There is also a paper of unprepared translation from Latin.

zeal and devotion, and are soon caught up into the parochial mill. With no opportunities and no habits of reading, and little skill in the art of reading wisely and profitably, and sometimes criticized as not doing their job if they manifest any such tendencies, their mental efforts are confined to preparing sermons and addresses which may satisfy or weary or annoy the faithful, but which are seldom more than declarations of personal or other people's convictions neither explained nor defended in a way likely to convince anyone who does not already share them.

It is this state of affairs which makes the outlook for the future as serious as the remedy for it is obvious. Christianity as a religion maintained and taught by an institution is clearly neither wholly a life nor wholly a doctrine but both : it is a life largely determined by and built upon a doctrine. In the modern world it is imperative that priests of the Christian Church should be able to expound and defend the Christian philosophy of life, its grounds, and the conduct proper to it, against the many theories and indifferences which challenge it. There will, of course, always be a few men of unusual and outstanding gifts of other kinds which may more than compensate for deficiency in this respect. But this implies no modification of the urgent requirement that the clergy as a body should be men who know their business, which, if the Church is to regain or extend her influence, must be increasingly a teaching and a thinking business. Otherwise we shall be in a vicious circle in which we shall never get the best type of ordinands : an unsatisfactory clergy will but produce their kind. And, though no knowledge is wholly irrelevant in a clergyman's life, it is much more important that he should know his own business than that he should know other people's. Intelligent and fair men will not expect him to be an all-round expert. His business is Christian Theology and its implications. Like most other things in the world this business has expanded considerably and is more complex than it was. Indeed, one of the important qualifications of the clergyman is to know what is of fundamental importance and what is secondary. The first step is to change the conditions by which theological colleges are required to undertake the whole training of the clergy. Their staffs, though they include devoted and capable men, some of whom are expert in particular branches of

theology, are far too small to be able to supply first-class teaching in the whole field. Nor are most of those colleges, by reason of their isolation from the great centres of learning and thought, at all appropriate places for the study of theology. As our former President put it, we shall not raise a crop of exotics by keeping the gardeners in hot-houses while the young plants are in the open air. It is of equal importance and urgency that the Church should make all possible efforts to secure two things. One is to establish faculties of theology in those modern universities which at present lack them: the other is that the overwhelming majority of the clergy should have been submitted to the discipline only to be found in a competent theological school in a university. This requirement is much more important than insistence upon the possession of a degree of some or any kind by all candidates for ordination. A degree can mean very little indeed, and a poor or even a good one in some other subject is no evidence of competence to teach and defend the Christian faith. It is perhaps desirable that candidates should read some other subject at a university before reading theology in the same environment, if only because most students do not learn how to study with real profit until fairly late in their first course. But this is only possible in a few cases; in all others theology should almost invariably be the subject read by intending ordinands. Even the weak men, if such are to be ordained at all, would be the less weak for having endured this discipline, even if they failed to obtain a degree.

There should be an end to that extraordinary and foolish tendency to advise young men intending to be ordained not to study theology at a university. Again and again while I was an Oxford tutor and since I ceased to be one, I have come across this strange phenomenon, sometimes in the most surprising quarters. From the point of view of the Church's interests it is a suicidal tendency. The grounds on which it is usually justified are entirely mistaken. It is said that university theological schools do not provide an adequate training or preparation for the ministry. The answer is that they are not intended to do so; they leave alone those parts of the future clergyman's training to which the theological colleges can much better attend and which it used to be their function to undertake. But Christianity

is a historical religion whose charter is the Scriptures. Ideas that the authority, reliability and value of the Bible have been largely destroyed by modern knowledge and studies is very widely spread; it involves great difficulties in presenting Christianity and its claims upon the lives and minds of men. In the circumstances of the modern world more particularly, and even in ordinary circumstances, it is blind foolishness to say that a course of study is not essential which embraces the Scriptures, Christian doctrine, and the Church's own history — a thorough course of study carried on throughout by the use of the same historical and critical principles and methods now universally prevalent in the educated world. And such study can best be pursued within a university, indeed cannot be adequately pursued outside one. In a university there are expert teachers in all branches of theology, always available and ready to advise and help students; the same advantages do not and cannot exist in theological colleges. The maintenance of these expert faculties of theology does not cost the Church a penny: they are at hand for her use. Of equal importance is the fact that throughout his university course the student of theology can mix and talk with men of the most varied interests and types of mind and outlook who are pursuing other subjects of study. Three or four years in such an environment should and do have valuable effects in forming and training the mind, which is more important than the mere acquisition of information; they make a student aware of the importance of studies other than his own and of knowledge in general; he becomes aware of the atmosphere of the thought of the modern world and, at least to some extent, alive to its changes and their significance. The clergyman of whom this is not true will not possess half his potential value, whatever his other qualities. It is next to impossible for him to acquire this temper and quality of mind in a theological college wherein his society will be exclusively that of men with the same dominant interests and intentions, and, very likely, with much the same outlook as his own. Of course this will not apply so strongly to theological college students who have already graduated in some other subject, though these too would be much the better for the more severe discipline in those subjects in which, as clergymen, they should be competent. This they can only obtain in a university.

Again, it is often said that the university theological schools are of less educational and cultural value than are the schools in other subjects. This opinion is due to ignorance. A man who reads theology seriously at a university will gain good knowledge of two or more ancient civilizations, a knowledge of archaeology and its value, some grounding in the principles of literary and historical criticism, and, as he studies the history of the formation of Christian doctrine and of the Church, some knowledge of the thought and civilization of the classical world. If the student is able and can afford the time, he can easily add to this list. Indeed, it is reasonable to claim that, with the sole exception of 'Greats,' a modern theological school in a university affords a better intellectual and cultural training than do the schools of natural science, history, English, modern languages and the rest. It is not, of course, of such direct commercial value as these other schools to men who are to enter the so-called secular professions, but that can hardly be an objection to it as a discipline for the intending clergyman.

The third reason sometimes given as justification for advising students not to read theology at a university is that it tends to undermine their faith. It is precisely the mentality which can put this forward as a serious objection which shows how necessary it is for young men to endure precisely this test. The clergyman to-day who has no sympathy with doubt, no knowledge of the causes of hesitations and confusions in belief, will be of very little use to anybody except as a minister to the faithful of the type whose faith depends upon a complete absence of thought. It is most important that clergymen should be men who have honestly faced doubt and the possibility that Christianity may be founded upon mistakes and may be therefore untrue. It is indeed difficult to avoid this challenge in reading theology at a university, though perhaps not so difficult as it is to face it squarely at a theological college. No study can be honest if the conclusions are prescribed, even unconsciously; and at a theological college, except within narrow limits and on questions of quite secondary importance, the conclusions are not only predetermined but are always in view, for they shape and colour the whole life and atmosphere of those places.

I have dealt at length with the aspect of clerical training in

comparison with which none seems to me to be so urgent and so important. It is certain to be objected that Christianity is not only a matter of the understanding, and that the clergy must be much more than dons or lecturers. That is true, and no one in his senses denies it. But no priest need be less effective and less devoted in other ways because he is able to teach intelligently, and adequately defend the things upon the truth of which his justification as a priest depends. Nor will he be truly effective without this qualification, except in very restricted circles.[2] There is a sympathetic readiness, even an eagerness, to listen to and respect anyone who is believed to be able to shed some light upon life and its meaning and its problems; but there is also a healthy and well-grounded conviction that the only persons who can do this are those who have learned to look at life and knowledge with open eyes and are not trying to dodge them in the name of the Lord. It is just this confidence in the clergy which is lacking, and the lack has more justification than it ought to have. The work of the clergyman is difficult enough, even with the fullest training. On the one hand it is essential that he speak and teach with authority, which is not at all the same thing as teaching *upon* authority. Yet there is a far-reaching difference between the mind of the Christian teacher and that proper to the scientific investigator at work upon his varied data, of which the monuments of religion are part. As a Christian, the priest stands committed to the truth of certain affirmations implied in the faith that certain values and experiences are not illusions or merely matters of personal taste, and to the reliability of the foundation facts of the Christian religion. This implies a state of mind different from that of the free-lance investigator who may to-day reach out tentatively towards a kind of pantheism or even theism, and to-morrow be equally ready to move towards materialism should 'the facts' seems so to require. Yet the scientific mind and methods are essential if what is to be taught as knowledge or as worthy of reasonable belief is to be more than the explication of personal convictions assumed as true from the start, and which will not inevitably mean

[2] There are, of course, men of outstanding spirituality of life to whom this does not apply; but they are few and are for the most part able and ready to acquire the knowledge requisite for the effective exercise of their gifts. To 'the daft saint' no general statements are likely to apply.

a premature forcing of fact so as to make it correspond with predetermined conclusions. It is hard to acquire a harmony of these two conditions of mind. It must be *won*, for it is not to be had in any other way. No qualification is more necessary in the clergyman of to-day. On all grounds the study of theology in the free atmosphere of universities should be an essential part of the training of the clergy.

Of course other aspects of training are of great importance. But it is exactly the reform I have insisted upon which will alone make it possible for other parts of the clergyman's training to be undertaken thoroughly by the theological colleges. At present this is not possible by reason of the altogether excessive demands made upon those colleges. Relieved of the burden of responsibility for the whole theological training of ordinands, they could devote themselves to pastoral and devotional training; more attention could be given to special branches of theology such as the characteristic doctrines and tenets of the Church of England in relation to those of other Churches. Adequate attention could be given, as at present it is not given, to the arts of preaching and teaching, and particularly to the clear articulation of the English tongue in an audible voice. An immense amount of effort is wasted, and what would otherwise be good work ruined, by glaring defects in these common arts which careful training could rectify. Quite apart from the matter of intellectual training in theology, no professional men are so poorly equipped in technical knowledge of their craft as the clergy of the Church of England. For the most part they must learn to teach, preach, read and sing by the light of nature, which is often darkness, and by such light as they can acquire in any haphazard fashion. This proper work of theological colleges cannot be done for lack of time due to the impossibly heavy tasks laid upon them.

There is little dispute about the subjects which should be included in the training of the clergy. For reasons already mentioned, a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures will always be paramount. With this must go a knowledge of Christian doctrine and its history, otherwise it cannot be taught intelligently with reference to the knowledge and needs of our own time. Nothing but harm is done by uninstructed criticism of Christian doctrine as exploded or out of date when the critic, particularly if he be

a clergyman, plainly knows little of what it is or of what it tried to articulate. The history of the Church is important, though I think less so than the two former subjects, but only in the sense that if necessary it could be studied in a theological college. But I would most earnestly plead that in these days it is disastrous to send men out to teach and defend the Christian faith without some knowledge of philosophy and some training in philosophical argument. For it is that kind of argument, even if of an untrained kind, which clergymen will often be called upon to meet by those not disposed to accept their teaching uncritically. Philosophy is a vast subject, and a great deal of its proper ground has no direct bearing upon the Christian faith. Far better than a general dabbling in the philosophical welter would be to require in every ordinand a thorough knowledge of some first-class works such as Dr. Tennant's *Philosophical Theology*, Dr. Oman's *The Natural and the Supernatural*, and Dr. A. E. Taylor's *The Faith of a Moralist*; not at all that the views of such writers need be adopted, but because they would show the student what is important and what is not, introduce him to all the great problems and encourage him to think about them intelligently. Without some equipment of this kind, competence in the Scriptures and in Christian doctrine is, in the modern world, of much less use than it ought to be. Philosophical theology should be an obligatory subject in the university theological schools.

It is unlikely that much improvement in the training of the clergy will soon take place. The financial factor is an important one, though much money is spent on less essential causes. The harm done is progressive. Even the university theological faculties suffer because they are so little used. Several colleges at Oxford and Cambridge which used to include a theologian among the Fellows now no longer do so. Thus the number of men with leisure and opportunity to become serious theologians is seriously reduced, to the loss of the Church, to the loss of her influence in the universities where it should be great, and to the loss of the universities also. But we must face the fact that for some time at least a large proportion of ordinands will be men of poor general education, who will continue to gain their theological knowledge in theological colleges. The best must be

made of what can only be a very second best. There is no justification for requiring these colleges to attempt the impossible, as at present they are doing. If men of defective education are to be ordained, there is nothing whatever to be said for a hasty course of training which is no useful education but resolves itself into overloading undeveloped memories. The time spent on getting up the elements of Greek sufficient to enable the candidate, largely by the aid of guesswork and his recollection of the English versions, to translate a few passages from set books of the New Testament, is valuable time painfully wasted. Similarly it is unprofitable to burden *these* candidates with too much minutiae of Old and New Testament literary criticism, which merely befogs them without developing their minds. There are enough clear and demonstrable results established with as much probability as is usual in human affairs. Nothing important for religion really turns on Professor So and So's theories in fields very largely speculative. For the men we have in mind what is really essential is that they should understand and be able to maintain the grounds of belief in God, possess a thorough acquaintance with the development of theology as recorded in the Scriptures, understand the Christian doctrines of man, grace and prayer, be able to teach and defend in modern terms the Church's doctrine of Christ, and the ideals of the Church of England.

Another method and course of training for the ministry is that developed by the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham, of which, from time to time, I have seen something. The course lasts for several years, and care is taken to bring the candidate's general education up to a good level before he is allowed to study theology. The conditions of living throughout the period of training are hard but healthy, and the rule of life is strict. There is something to be said for a young man who will accept it cheerfully for five years or more. The scheme has one inevitable and serious defect. The young men must needs live in a society of which all the members have the same intellectual interests and intentions. That can never be a good environment for the study of theology. Even so, the Kelham men I have met in parishes, even when their outlook has differed widely from my own, have nearly always impressed me as better instructed,

more efficient, equally energetic, and certainly not less open-minded than other non-university curates whose sole training has been received at an ordinary theological college. While I do not think that any wide extension of the Kelham scheme would be for the good of the Church of England, yet in view of the lack of men of means and education, and failing the type of training which is imperatively needed, there is a real and useful work being done at Kelham.

I can but refer briefly to the large question of post-ordination training. It bristles with practical difficulties. The understaffed condition of parishes; the ever-increasing round of parochial organizations so absorbent of clerical time and energy, which do nothing to increase the influence of the Church but which have become necessary if the priest is not to be charged with idleness and if the faithful are to be kept faithful in attendance at church; failure on the part of a not inconsiderable number of vicars to appreciate the importance of regular study by their junior colleagues—all these factors tend to nullify efforts to encourage post-ordination training. Those who have organized refresher courses and schools for the clergy lament bitterly that, all encouragements notwithstanding, very few of the younger clergy ever attend them. It is difficult to think that the Bishops could not do more to remedy this state of affairs. There is nothing unjust in insisting, as a condition of advancement in any office, upon fulfilment of the conditions of admittance to it. In our own diocese all ordinands, as a condition of acceptance, are required to attend classes once a week for some ten weeks in each of the three terms a year throughout the two years immediately following ordination. It is a first charge upon their time. This scheme is easily workable in a diocese in which no parish is more than twenty-two miles from the centre. In larger and more scattered dioceses, a number of centres for this purpose could be formed, if only there were sufficient competent instructors. The scheme itself is excellent, though I could wish the study entailed by it were additional to and did not displace the usual kind of examination for the Order of priesthood. What is more important than the accumulation of knowledge is the formation of habits of study; and the discipline of having

to 'get up' a number of good solid books is most salutary in the life of a young clergyman.

Some will feel that there are several subjects of great importance in the modern world of which the clergy should have a good working knowledge. There are; but I do not think they could be included in the pre-ordination training of clerical students at the cost of displacing or overshadowing the subjects which form the more proper business of the clergyman. What the Church needs is men who know their own job, have learned to study profitably and to think clearly, and to form their own judgments. Given such men, sensitive to the events and currents of thought and interests around them, they will naturally and easily acquire such additional knowledge as is relevant to their work. That too small a proportion of present-day ordinands can honestly be placed in such a category is a fact which casts a dark shadow over other more hopeful tendencies in the Church of England.

THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Rev. E. C. Ratcliff, M.A., Fellow and Chaplain of Queen's College, Oxford.

THE history of great English institutions is in large part the history of the lesser institutions which exist within them. The history of the two ancient Universities and their several colleges could be drawn upon to illustrate this theme; and an even more ample illustration could be found in the history of the Church of England. Indeed until a few years ago, the Church of England must have seemed an extraordinarily elusive entity to any enquiring foreigner familiar with continental models, whether Catholic or Protestant. He could have acquainted himself with parishes and dioceses. He could have studied the Convocations of Canterbury and York. He could have learned something, if he had time, of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and of their place within, and influence upon, the Church of England. He could have observed the religious and ecclesiastical societies, each founded to emphasize this or that aspect of the Church's character and mission, and not a few in opposition to all the others. Yet he would only have found a number of institutions, no one of which could be described as co-ordinating, uniting, or summarizing the others, and no one of which, until the creation of the National Assembly of the Church of England, would have thought of saying, or would have presumed to say, *L'Eglise, c'est-moi.* Even had he encountered the Church Assembly, it is to be doubted whether our foreigner's enquiry would have been simplified. The most recent of the Church's institutions might indeed say with definiteness *L'Eglise, c'est-moi*; but on investigation, it would present the same problem as all other Church institutions. For the problem with which the Church of England confronts most foreigners and some Englishmen is not one so much of discovering its centre as of discerning its character. Initial failure to discern

its character is the source of all difficulty in understanding the Church of England in general and its institutions, in each of which its character is reflected more or less clearly, in particular.

Our foreigner's difficulty in understanding the Church would have arisen from the fact that he had embarked upon his investigation with a definite expectation. He had expected to find a society, described as the Church, clearly distinguished, and distinguishable, from another society, described as the State. Here, he deserves our pardon. On the continent, the Roman Catholic Church and most of the Protestant religious bodies are rightly to be considered in this way. In England, on the other hand, the continental categories do not (as yet) apply. The Church of England is still, by law, a National Church, as that term was understood in the sixteenth century; and for all that the use of the terms 'Church' and 'State' is sanctioned by the highest authorities, it is strictly inaccurate and can be tolerated only for the sake of convenience. A National Church is 'one and the self-same multitude,' so Richard Hooker has expressed it, as the commonwealth. The distinction between 'Church' and 'State' in England, therefore, is not one of society, but of functions and certain qualities. 'Albeit properties and actions of one kind do cause the name of a commonwealth, qualities and functions of another sort the name of a Church to be given unto a multitude,' says Hooker, 'yet one and the salf-same multitude may . . . be both, and is so with us.'[1] This conception of 'Church' and 'State' underlies, or is implied by, English legislation relating to ecclesiastical matters, and is embodied in English Church institutions. Though colloquial usage of the terms is convenient in its brevity, we shall be misleading if by 'Church' and 'State' in England we mean anything other than the exercise of ecclesiastical and temporal authority and functions within the one society of the nation.

As an introduction to a paper on the National Assembly of the Church of England, the preceding remarks may seem unnecessary. The facts recalled in them, it might be supposed, are universally known. A knowledge of their own Church history, however, is not widespread among members of the Church of England; and the most active and vocal of them, both in

[1] *Ecclesiastical Policy*, VIII, 1 (2).

speech and action, assume the fundamental principles and the character of the Church of England to be other than they are. They approach ecclesiastical questions from the same standpoint and with the same expectation as our foreigner's. Unlike him, on the other hand, they find what they expect. They find two *societates perfectae*, a Church and a State. The chances of history, they believe, have wrongfully subjected the Church to the power of the State; and the events of history, they allege, have shown that the State is not slow to use its power. This is proved, they continue, by recent events. The Parliament of the Church, *i.e.* the Assembly, has been flouted, so they assert, on certain important occasions, by the Parliament of the State, which exhibits an unwillingness to admit the Church's competence to control its own most intimate affairs. It is only the apathy of Churchmen, we are sometimes informed, that prevents the Church from taking the field against the State. The erroneousness of this interpretation of our situation is in proportion to its picturesqueness; for picturesque in some aspects it certainly is. Its picturesqueness may account for the scale on which this misinterpretation has inspired certain misconceptions as to the status and function of several Church institutions, particularly of the Church Assembly. Before considering the work of the Assembly, it is, then, necessary to answer the question, What is the appointed status and function of the Assembly within the National Church?

The Assembly's function is stated in Section 19 of its Constitution,[2] which derives legal sanction from the Enabling Act of 1919. The Constitution states that 'the Assembly shall be free to discuss any proposal concerning the Church of England and to make provision in respect thereof, and where such provision requires parliamentary sanction the authority of Parliament shall be sought in such manner as may be prescribed by statute.' Further, 'the Assembly or any of the three Houses thereof may debate and formulate its judgment by resolution upon any matter concerning the Church of England or otherwise of religious or public interest.' Section 14 also contains two restrictive clauses; the first prescribing procedure in matters

[2] For the text of the Constitution, see *Official Year Book of the Church of England*, 1935, pp. 109-111.

affecting public worship, and the second prohibiting the Assembly from issuing any statement purporting to define the doctrine of the Church. These restrictions are mild in effect; for in neither case do they set limits to discussion. The Assembly's function, it will be observed, is of wide exercise. Its power of discussion is almost unlimited; and its power of action, in the formulation and presentation of measures for parliamentary authorization, is considerable. Speaking of the Assembly on the eve of its creation in 1919, the present Bishop of Durham described it as 'a subordinate legislature.'[3] The Assembly is indeed a legislature in so far as it has power to formulate measures which are intended for legalization. The Assembly falls short of a legislature, however, in one essential respect. It has no power of investing its measures with the authority of law; and it has no means, direct or indirect, of compelling Parliament to do so. To Parliament alone belongs the power of granting, or withholding, legalization. Although Parliament waived its inherent right of amending the Assembly's measures, its power in the matter of legalization is free in exercise and final in effect. The Assembly may not incorrectly be described as the Parliament of the Church, if we use the word in its etymological sense and mean by it a gathering of persons whose primary business it is to confer and discuss. But the Assembly is not the Parliament of the Church in the sense of being the ecclesiastical equivalent of the Parliament of the Nation. The Parliament of the Nation continues to be that of the Church, as in times past, in virtue of its retention of ultimate control over all ecclesiastical legislation. Parliament, therefore, and not the Assembly, is the true and lawful guardian of the rights and interests of members of the Church of England, both clerical and lay — a fact dramatically recognized by the City of London in 1926 in its appeal to the House of Commons against an Assembly measure for pulling down certain city churches. The place and status of the Assembly within the National Church, in spite of the privileges and powers with which Parliament has endowed the Assembly, are those of a Parliamentary Committee having as its function the work of advising and assisting Parliament in

[3] See *Chronicle of Convocation (Canterbury)*, 1919, Upper House, May 6, p. 269 (speech of the Bishop of Hereford).

the exercise of the latter's ecclesiastical powers — a Parliamentary Committee *sui generis* perhaps, but a Parliamentary Committee nevertheless.

To most of the present company this ground will doubtless be familiar. Yet the issues at stake are such that we need constantly to be reminding ourselves and our fellow-Churchmen of what the true position of the Assembly is. If there be any truth in the contention advanced at the beginning of this paper, that the history of the Church of England is the history of its institutions, then, as being now the principal, and most powerful and permanent, of those institutions, the Assembly is destined to be the main determining factor in the future history of the Church. Consequently, if the Establishment is to be maintained in its existing form, it is vitally necessary that Churchmen in general, and members of the Assembly in particular, should think rightly concerning the Assembly. A wrong view may easily lead to a situation, from which the Assembly cannot retreat without loss of 'face,' and the consequences of which must be suffered by the Church. There are indications that certain individual members of the Assembly, in attaching to it an exaggerated importance, fail in proportion to regard parliamentary authority with the heed which is its due. A prominent clerical member, for instance, some years ago introduced certain services of the rejected Prayer Book in the cathedral over which he then had control. Another clerical member has pursued the same course; and, alluding to the Book as 'drawn up by the representative body of the Church of England — the Church Assembly,' justifies his action by saying: 'While the House of Commons refused to give any imprimatur to the book, it did not wish to interfere with the Church using it. It did not, for example, set in motion any action for compelling the bishops and inferior clergy to adhere to the law as it still exists.'[4] It might be said in answer that Parliament did not expect a rejected Bill to be treated as though the rejection had not occurred. The sincerity of this interpretation of the House of Commons' action minimizes neither the curiousness of the interpretation, nor the gravity of the attitude implied towards a pronouncement of Parliament. If the Assem-

[4] See *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1935. Article, 'Why change the Communion Service?' by A. S. Duncan Jones.

bly as a whole were to develop a similar attitude of mind, Parliament would be compelled, sooner or later, to take cognizance of it, with results which the greater number of Church people would deplore. In the interests of religion and of the Church's work in England, it is essential that nothing should be done to create a 'Church and State' mentality either in the Assembly or in the Church at large. It is the duty of all Churchmen, whether professedly 'Modern' or otherwise, to discourage manifestations of such mentality wherever they may appear; and even to be ready, if the occasion should demand, to follow the example set by the City of London in invoking the protection of Parliament against improper action on the part of the Assembly. It would be a breach of a sacred trust if the Church allowed itself to be led by the Assembly (or by any other of its institutions) to repudiate the alliance with the Nation. Those persons, whether within or without the Assembly, who wish to see it, or who urge it to, undertake the office of champion of the Church's liberties against alleged Parliamentary repression would do well to remind themselves that the very existence of the Assembly is pledge of goodwill towards the Church on the part of Parliament and Nation, and of their readiness to assist the Church towards the effective performance of its work.

This brings us to another question. To what end, we must now ask, was its function appointed to the Assembly? For some time before the War, it will be remembered, the pressure of business was such that Parliament could spare little time for the concerns of the Church. A frequent lay criticism of the Church at this time was that its machinery and procedure were those of a past age. The constant subjects of complaint were those which closely touched the working of the parishes, such as the difficulty of dealing with negligent incumbents, the need of enabling clergy incapable of work to retire, the want of proper provision for pensions, the appointment of incumbents without consultation with the parishioners, and the like. These defects in particular, it was urged, constituted a hindrance to the progress of religion; and the point could not be denied. For, ultimately, the work of the Church of England is the work of the parochial clergy. If the parochial clergy are too aged, lazy or decrepit to do their work, the work of the Church is being left undone. If

they are hindered from doing their work by poverty or other harsh circumstances, the work of the Church suffers hindrance. No multiplication of dioceses and bishops, no increase of conferences and synods, no extension of publicity for church officials, can take the place of the clergyman's work in his parish. Reform in the directions indicated, however, could be introduced only with the assistance and by the authority of Parliament. Parliamentary procedure is inevitably slow; and if Parliament had little time for ecclesiastical business before the War, it had less or none after the War. The passing of the Enabling Act, setting up the National Assembly of the Church, provided the necessary means for securing the necessary reforms. Whatever may have been the hopes and intentions of the minority of the Churchmen who worked for its creation, the *raison d'être* of the Assembly, as it was understood in the country, was to effect reform and by watchfulness and appropriate action to prevent the necessity of reform from recurring. It is not untrue to say that there would have been weighty and perhaps successful opposition to the creation of the Assembly, if the need for reform had not been obvious, if the amount of reform required had not been great, and if the reform proposed had not promised improvement in matters of parish concern. In a word, the creation of the Assembly seemed to be a decisive step towards the promotion of the Christian religion in the parishes of England. The primary task of the Assembly, therefore, is to be careful for the advancement of religion in the parishes. Its measures should bear this end in mind; and in order to achieve it faithfully and with profit, it might be expected to remember that, as it was intended to be a body representative of laity and clergy, so it would consider the needs and rights of all parishioners (not only, that is, of those whose names were to be seen on the electoral roll) on the one hand, and on the other it would cherish the freedom and dignity of status of the parish clergyman, and safeguard him in the preservation of his self-respect.

To learn with what success the Assembly has performed its task, we must make a rapid survey of the tenor of its principal Measures. During its fifteen years of existence it has presented sixty-one Measures to Parliament, and of these only four have

been rejected. Five new dioceses have been created. Powers have been granted to the Convocations of Canterbury and York for amending the constitution of their Lower Houses. Certain rural deaneries and parishes have been transferred from one diocese or another to its neighbour in the interest of greater easiness in diocesan administration. Commissioners have been appointed 'to assist the Cathedral Authorities to revise their statutes, to frame new statutes and to prepare schemes for enabling the Cathedrals more properly to adapt themselves to the needs and opportunities of the present and future.' The desirability of certain of these Measures, more particularly of the Cathedrals Measure, might be debated. Taken as a whole, however, and interesting as they may be as intended to make for an increase of efficiency in the general work of the Church of England, these Measures do not affect the vast majority of the parochial clergy and their parishes, and consequently are not an accurate gauge of the Assembly's power for good or ill in the Church's life.

From this point of view the most important Measures are those which purport to effect reform in the matters mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Attempts have been made to remedy the defect in every case. Measures passed in 1926 and 1930 make it possible for aged clergymen without financial resources to retire on a pension and so make way for a successor young enough to perform the work of the parish. The Dilapidations Measures of 1923 and 1929 are intended to lighten the financial burden of an outgoing incumbent; in so doing they may be taken as an additional encouragement to a disabled clergyman who would resign his benefice, but is hindered by financial considerations. Considered without reference to details, these Measures appear unexceptionable. The Pensions Measure of 1926 was introduced into Parliament as a matter of peculiar urgency for the well-being of the clergy, and a request was made that Parliament should refrain from debating it, on the ground that it had been fully discussed in the Assembly. Opposition to the form of the Measure had been voiced in the Assembly, so that it may have been feared that, on examination of the Measure, Parliament would reject it. The details of the Pensions Scheme are now well known, and those who have read the

comments of the Dean of Wells in *Theology*[5] and the penetrating and often caustic Prefaces to the annual editions of *Crockford's Clerical Directory* will know what criticisms can be made against the Scheme. Yet whatever may be said concerning the financing of the Scheme and the qualification for earning the Pension, the parochial clergy have against the Measure certain other complaints which the ecclesiastical authorities choose to ignore. The purpose of the Measure would have been achieved, if the clergy had been left free to make provision for their old age in ways suited to their individual preferences. A Measure could have been so framed as to arrange for this, and the clergy, while compelled to contribute to a Pensions Scheme, could have enjoyed the freedom allowed in this respect to *e.g.* University teachers. Not unnaturally the clergy resent unnecessary interference in their private affairs, and object to an unjustifiable curtailment of their personal liberty. Further, they are for the most part men of small financial resources. Their resentment therefore is increased by the treatment meted out to them by the Pensions Authority which shows for their difficulties none of the consideration of the Collector of Income Tax. Whether or not the full amount of income is received, the clergy are called upon to pay pension contribution on the full amount, with the knowledge that inability to pay will be disregarded and, if necessary, visited with legal consequences. Again, the Pensions Authority includes in an incumbent's contribution a levy on the reputed value of his parsonage. The incumbent is compelled to live in the parsonage, however it may exceed his requirements, and is debarred from choosing a house commensurate in accommodation with his needs and in value and demands with his means. The extra levy is reasonably considered by the incumbent therefore as pure exaction. His liabilities, with few or no assets, were heavy enough before 1926. Since 1926, they have been greatly increased by the Pensions and Dilapidations Measures in succession. His assets remain unchanged; and it is not easier for

[5] See *Theology*, January, 1934. Future editors of 'Documents relating to the Administration of the Church of England in the Twentieth Century' will be tempted, on internal grounds, to regard the writer of the comments as identical with the author of the Prefaces of *Crockford*. The cumulative value of the writings will not thereby be lessened. They are the work of an eye-witness.

him to live, because he is told that he will benefit from the new levies if he survives long enough. In conferring upon the parochial clergy the alleged blessing of the Pensions Scheme and Dilapidations Measure, the Assembly displays a strange ignorance of the circumstances which ensure single-minded discharge of duty. A man whose mind is oppressed by financial burdens and who is distracted by the necessity of incurring debt suffers in his self-respect, and cannot devote himself fully and freely to his work. The parochial clergy have not been rendered immune, by their ordination, from this class of human frailty.

Two other Measures profoundly affect the parochial clergyman. These are the Ecclesiastical Duties Measure of 1926 and the Exercise of Rights of Patronage Measure of 1931. In a sermon printed in *The Modern Churchman*[6] in 1931, I ventured to submit some criticisms of these Measures. It would be tedious to repeat these criticisms, although not inappropriate; nothing has occurred to require a modification of them. Suffice it, therefore, to say that the position of the parochial clergyman is rendered more difficult by them. It is an excellent thing that a bishop should be able to deal with an incumbent who is guilty of 'inadequate performance of duty' or 'negligence.' But when the offence is not defined and parishioners who dislike their incumbent for whatever reason can accuse him to the bishop for 'negligence,' the incumbent cannot feel himself to be in enjoyment of that freedom which in civil callings is held to be a condition of initiative and of a proper sense of responsibility in work. In the summary in *The Official Year-Book of the Church of England*,[7] the Exercise of Rights of Presentation Measure is stated to give to the bishop 'a discretionary power of refusing any really unsuitable nominee, without . . . . injury to the reputation of the clergyman whose name is put forward.' Those familiar with the terms of the Measure will consider this statement euphemistic. The clergyman whose appointment is known to have been disallowed for reasons not divulged is branded as unsuitable for preferment. Anyone acquainted with the circumstances of an average town or country parish will know to what a serious extent a clergyman's public and private ministry, as well as his self-respect, can be damaged by this reproach. The

[6] *The Modern Churchman*, June, 1931. [7] p. 172.

Assembly's professed purpose in these two Measures could have been achieved by different procedure. In adopting the methods prescribed in the Measures, the Assembly, by setting the parochial clergyman at a disadvantage, has not assisted the work of the Church. It has increased over him the hold of the bishop, and this may have been part of its intention. But certain melancholy chapters in Church history warn us that these two things are not necessarily one and the same.

It will be recalled that out of the sixty-one Measures presented by the Assembly, Parliament has rejected four. The first of these was the Shrewsbury Diocese Measure, which, though passed in the Assembly was opposed in the area to which it would have been applied. Mention has already been made of the London City Churches Measure, which though opposed in the City was nevertheless passed by the Assembly. The remaining two Measures rejected were the Prayer Book Revision Measures of 1927 and 1928. By general consent, the rejection of the Prayer Book Measures was a challenge to the competence of the Assembly in a manner in which the rejection of the other Measures was not. Although the present Prayer Book and the law governing its use is in certain respects too straight for the present day, the Book nevertheless commands the affection and assent of Churchmen of every shade of thought, and is also an object of veneration to a vast number of Englishmen whose religious practice is not that of the Establishment. The proposed revision of the Prayer Book was necessarily experimental in some degree. It could not as yet claim the affection of Churchmen, but it was essential that it should be supported by their assent. That it was not so supported was made abundantly clear by correspondence in the press, resolutions of meetings and societies, and in a variety of ways. The public misgiving affected the Assembly itself, as the voting on both occasions showed; in 1927, out of a total number of 650 votes, 133 were cast against the Measure, and in 1928 the total voting had fallen to 579, in which the dissentients had increased by 50. Notwithstanding, the Measures were presented to Parliament as representing the ascertained wish of Assembly and Church alike. Referring to Parliament's action in his recent book, *Our National Church*,[8]

[8] pp. 124, 125.

Dr. Dearmer writes: 'Many members of Parliament in 1927 and 1928 thought that the Church Assembly was not in fact representative of the Church as a whole, and Parliament was well aware that there was strong opposition to the proposed alterations of the Deposited Book among Church people of very different schools of thought'; and in a footnote he adds: 'The franchise of the "electoral roll" is not easy to work, partly because people (especially working people) are very shy about putting their names to documents.'

Dr. Dearmer here raises a crucial issue, upon the decision of which must depend judgment as to the use and value of the Assembly in the life and work of the National Church. In the case of the four rejected Measures, Parliament, and not Parliament's Committee, the Assembly, was the true interpreter of the wish of those affected by the Measures. The discrepancy between the Assembly's will and that of its constituents in the case of the two former Measures was significant enough; in the case of the Prayer Book Measures, the significance of the discrepancy could not be over-estimated. Had those affected by and opposed to other controversial Measures had an equal opportunity of expressing their mind, it is not unreasonable to suppose that an equal discrepancy would have come into view. Is it possible, then, to regard the Assembly as genuinely representative of those whom it claims to represent, the clergy and laity of the Church? And if not, of whom and of what can the Assembly be said to be representative?

In the sermon already mentioned, I presumed to suggest an answer to these questions. The situation has not changed since 1931, and the answer suggested then is, I dare to think, still applicable. Of the three Houses of the Assembly, only the House of Bishops fully represents its Order. The membership of the House of Clergy numbers 320, of which 113 sit *ex officio*. The House of Laity consists of 342 members, of whom none sit *ex officio*, but who have no direct contact with the parishes, being elected by the lay members of the Diocesan Conferences.

The unrepresentative character of the House of Clergy is patent. Of the 113 *ex officio* members, 26 are Deans of Cathedrals, who as representing learning are an asset to their House. The remaining 87 are archdeacons (10 of them suffragan

bishops), who thus compose more than a quarter of the whole House. The archdeacons can hardly be said to represent the clergy, they represent rather the diocesan bishops whose officers they are. It would make for greater freedom in deliberation and decision in the House of Clergy, and it would also make that House more representative, if the archdeacons ceased to sit as *ex officio* members and became candidates for election (if they so wished) on the same terms as elected members. In this event, the House of Clergy would admittedly no longer consist of the two Lower Houses of the Convocations as at present constituted. but this should not prove an insurmountable difficulty to reform, if the principle of representation be sincerely accepted and applied. Taking the two clerical Houses of the Assembly together, we cannot but note that the predominant influence in them is that of the bishops; and the same influence is observable in Assembly Measures relating to the parochial clergy. The parson's freehold has been so modified as now to be of small worth, while the power of the diocesan bishop has been correspondingly enlarged. It may be that the English bishops think it desirable that their powers should approximate to those of their overseas brethren. It is sometimes said that the episcopate is more of a reality in the Colonies than in England, and that the Colonial bishop is less an official, and more a father and chief pastor. The Colonial clergy, on the other hand, are not unanimous in approval of the difference. It is sometimes forgotten that what in the palace is held to be the paternal solicitude of a chief pastor, in the parsonage often resembles the inescapable goading of a gadfly. Whatever the merits of these two systems, however, it cannot fairly be claimed that the House of Clergy will be properly representative of its constituents until all its members, save the twenty-six Deans, are elected by them. At present for practical purposes, as the Measures show, the House of Clergy may be taken with that of the Bishops as representing the point of view of the Bishops and their officials.

The members of the House of Laity, as we have seen, are elected by lesser representative bodies. In theory they derive their authorization ultimately from the parishes, and are supposed to be representative of those whose names are inscribed on the electoral rolls. It is well known that for some time the

electoral rolls have been a cause of uneasiness to the ecclesiastical authorities. There is a marked unwillingness on the part of parishioners, as Dr. Dearmer points out, to inscribe their names on the electoral rolls. In comparatively rare cases can those whose names appear on the rolls constitute anything more than a small minority in a parish. The consequences of this are serious. The Parochial Church Councils, taken as a whole, represent no more than these minorities; and the Parochial Church Councils form the base of the lay representation system, of which the House of Laity in the Assembly is the apex. The claim of the House of Laity, therefore, to represent the Churchmen of England is without any foundation. This was foreseen in 1919, when the Assembly was created. It was predicted that the system of the electoral roll would have the effect of weakening the hold upon each other of the Church and the ordinary layman. The prediction has been fulfilled. Even those who are more, rather than less, frequent communicants are hesitant about inscribing their names, let alone those whose qualification is confined to baptism. This may be due in part to the fact that enrolment is connected in the minds of many with 'Church work,' which they hold to be a specialized activity suited to persons of a particular temperament. Whatever the reason may be, it is the experience of many observers that the great multitude of laity, without wishing to sever themselves from the Church, stand aside from, and do not regard themselves as concerned in, the new parochial and diocesan machinery with the Church Assembly as its centre. In practice (whatever the theory may be) they are not represented by or in the House of Laity.

This is a matter of profoundest regret and anxiety. Not the least value of the Assembly, in the eyes of those who beheld its creation with less enthusiasm than acquiescence, was that it promised to provide a means of bringing this large constituency to a more conscious membership of the Church by giving it representation in the councils of the Church. If the promise has not been fulfilled, the Church and the Assembly are immeasurably weaker. For this constituency does not consist only of a silent multitude who will follow their leaders; it comprises men and women who are to be found in every profession of life, who exercise a certain influence and authority in the

communities in which they live, and who are not infrequently leaders of thought and action in larger groups throughout the country.

In whatever way it may be solved, the problem of lay representation is pressing and calls for an early solution. Not the Assembly only but the whole Church would benefit by a House of Laity, representative of something more than Diocesan Conferences. At present the third House seems to lack independence, and by readiness to submit to official guidance, seems to subscribe to a notion that the Assembly exists to do what the officials wish. For one reason, at least, a strong House of Laity is a necessity. The Assembly is necessarily occupied to a great extent with finance. Its financial proposals proceed from official circles, which include of course laymen as well as ecclesiastics. But there is more than a tendency to frown upon enquiry into financial matters from whichever direction enquiry may proceed. The clergy are never credited with financial acumen, and enquiries from their House meet with a lofty reception. A strong House of Laity could enquire; could compel information to be laid before it, and could make criticisms which the officials could not afford to ignore. It could also, when occasion arose, effectively protect the clergy when they are made victims of financial arrangements from which their House alone cannot protect them. It might, with advantage, for instance, insist on a statement of details of the annual office expenditure of £10,000 shown by the Pensions Board, and for which the clergy are made to pay but of which, at present, details are refused. A strong and genuinely representative House of Laity, in short, could do much to gain for the Assembly, from clergy no less than from laymen themselves, a confidence and respect which at the moment it lacks, but which it must at some time win, if its aims are to succeed.

The note of complaint audible throughout this paper may suggest to its hearers that the writer is to be classed with those who would wish to see Parliament either abolish the Assembly or else suspend its sitting *sine die*. The silencing of Convocation in 1717 might be used as a precedent for the latter course, if the former seemed too drastic. There is indeed much to recommend one or the other. The activity of the Assembly has been to no

small extent mischievous. Created primarily to expedite reform and to ease the difficulties of the parochial clergy, it has interpreted its mandate as authorization to alter the balance of power within the Church of England, and to enlarge the authority of the diocesan bishop at the expense of the status and dignity of the parochial clergyman, who now finds himself, as a result of its attention, depressed and impoverished as he never was before. Further, claiming for it Parliamentary rank, the official party within the Assembly have yet seen to it that Parliamentary methods are not employed, so that a formal opposition cannot exist, debate is rarely full or free, and decision, except on minor issues, is pre-arranged. Increasingly since 1927, the officials and their supporters have tended to ignore the relation of the Assembly to Parliament, and to claim for the subordinate body the prestige and rights, if not the full powers, of its suzerain. This is supported by the assertion of a representative character, which facts disprove. Deceived by this unfounded assertion, the Assembly appears to suppose that whatever it does is what its constituents desire, or alternatively, that its constituents will desire whatever it does. Should it be suspected that neither proposition is true in any given case, reassurance is recaptured by the recollection that representative bodies know the mind and needs of their constituents more accurately than the constituents know them themselves. This is perhaps a common fault of the representative bodies of democratic communities; and it may be unfair to treat it as an unamiable peculiarity of the Church Assembly. None the less, the Church Assembly has bred distrust among those in whose name it professes to speak; with the result that an institution which might have drawn Church and Nation, ecclesiastical authorities and people, into closer relationship, has been operative in producing the reverse effect.

The potentiality for harm of the Church Assembly is evident. Yet, for all the tale of its iniquities, the abolition or suspension of it would eventually be a greater loss than gain. It might reasonably be argued that the case against the Assembly is a case not against the institution as such, but against the persons who at present control it and use it for their own purposes. *Abusus non tollit usum*; and freed from its existing regimen, the Assembly can become one of the most valuable elements in the

constitution of the Church of England. Its promise of good is in equal proportion to its potentiality for harm. For one thing, if it continues to exist, it will have an opportnuity of correcting its mistakes. On more than one occasion, it has already been compelled to amend its Measures. A future generation of Assembly members may not improbably see the propriety of amending, not merely the construction, but also the conception of the Measures of its predecessors. The history of Parliament is encouraging in this respect. But if the Assembly is to fulfil its latent promise of good it must command the confidence and respect of clergy and people. For this, there are two major requisites. First, it must resist the temptation to regard itself as the council of management of a sect. Mindful of the conditions of its establishment, it must understand its relation to Parliament in terms of the historic English idea of the National Church. The second requisite is intimately connected with the first. The Assembly must be in fact, as well as in name, representative. An Assembly satisfying these two requisites will be strong in itself, and will impart its strength to the Church; for it will wield a weight of moral authority, which a friendly Parliament will readily recognize, and a hostile Parliament will fear to disregard.

The regeneration of the Assembly after this manner is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Not many years hence, if it be not accomplished by then, it may be an urgent necessity. It would be rash to forecast the future. Yet no discerner of the signs of the times can have failed to observe at work, in our body politic, certain forces which, if they become dominant, will change the fashion of English life. To-day events move with lightning rapidity; and we can no longer expect that change in our society will be, as it has been in the past, gradual and imperceptible like the processes of nature. It behoves us, therefore, to look forward as far as we may, and to be prepared to defend ideas, principles and institutions, which we hold to be of permanent worth to humanity, lest some sudden change should sweep them away before we have time to act. It is by no means impossible that within the next two or three lustres, or perhaps sooner, we shall see some form of Totalitarian State established in these islands. Violence is not a necessary prelude to such a

state; a decisive General Election and a series of Acts of Parliament, we have been warned, would suffice to introduce it. Whether our Totalitarianism be Right or Left in type, it is improbable that it would favour the maintenance of the Church's alliance with the Nation. Disestablishment and disendowment of the Church would be effected in the name of public interest. We cannot be confident of even the tolerance of Totalitarianism. The Totalitarian State, as Signor Mussolini defines it, 'is all-embracing; outside of it no human or spiritual values exist, much less have value.'[9] In Italy, this doctrine has not been interpreted as a denial of the claims of the Christian religion. But conflict, as we know, is latent,; and when the Totalitarian State is definitely Left in type, conflict with the Christian Church is inevitable. It is no wild imagining that well within our lifetime the leaders of our Church may be called upon to defend not only the Christian Religion, but also the liberties of the human spirit. We may suppose that the attack will be neither spectacular nor straight-forward. That will but increase the difficulties of the defence. Yet in whatever way circumstances may shape the manner of it, the defence will be immeasurably strengthened and sustained, if it be supported by an undeniably representative, and consequently authoritative, Church Assembly. Love of, and belief in, representative institutions is deeply rooted in the English heart and mind; and the history of our people encourages us to think that in England no cause, championed by a representative institution, is ultimately a lost cause.

[9] See *Fascism, Doctrine and Institutions*, p. 11.

THE CHURCH COURTS

By Robert C. Nesbitt, a Member of the House of Laity and sometime a Member of Parliament.

NO one who listened to the impressive address of the present Archbishop of Canterbury when, as Archbishop of York and Chairman of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, he presented the report of that Commission to the Church Assembly at the Summer Session of 1926, could fail to realize the difficulty of the task that confronted the Church. The whole history of the ecclesiastical courts is intricate and complicated and the masterly researches of Dr. Stubbs, Dr. Freeman and Dr. Westcott, laid before the earlier Commission of 1883, absorbingly interesting as they are, serve but to emphasize the long and tangled relationship between Church and State.

The Archbishop of Canterbury realized that the Commission was not to attempt to create a system of Courts on purely theoretical considerations. 'We cannot write,' he says, 'in this matter on a clean slate. The Diocesan and Provincial Courts run deep into the history of the Church and indeed of the nation, and they cannot be ignored; and the position of a Court of Final Appeal is necessarily determined by our existing relations with the State.' Whether or no these relations are for the good or for the hindrance of the life of the Church, or for religion, is not strictly germane to the present problem. 'We must accept them,' says His Grace, 'for the present as they are. We cannot unmake the Diocesan and Provincial Courts. What we have to do is to try and make them better.'

The Committee whose Report the Archbishop of Canterbury was presenting was appointed so long ago as the Summer Session of 1923. It was then resolved that a committee be appointed to consider the question of re-constituting the Diocesan and Provincial Courts and the Court of Appeal with a view to preparing a measure for the consideration of the Assembly, it being an instruction to this Committee to consider the best method of constituting ecclesiastical courts so as to ensure the confidence of the Church. That is more than twelve years ago, but although

His Grace at the Summer Session of 1926 stated that the Assembly considered the task of undertaking a reform of the ecclesiastical courts could no longer be delayed, nine years have elapsed since his speech and, so far as I am aware, no steps of any kind have been taken towards preparing a measure dealing with the subject for the consideration of the Assembly as contemplated by the resolution of the Assembly twelve years ago.

It must be a matter of disappointment to many Church people, and it is particularly so to the writer of this paper, that the Archbishop's Commission on the relations of Church and State, which was appointed under the terms of the resolution passed by the Church Assembly on the 5th February, 1930, now five and a half years ago, has not been able yet to present its report, though, as I gather, the final sittings of the Commission for taking evidence were concluded in July 1933. I was hopeful that the report would have contained some reference to the matters with which I am now about to deal and would thus have enabled me the better to deal with them.

May I say I am not approaching the consideration of these matters from the point of view of any particular school of thought.

I intend to devote the greater part of this paper to the position of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which is the final Court of Appeal, and to which so much of the address of His Grace in 1926 was devoted. I may say at the outset that I am against any alteration of this jurisdiction. I add that I believe it to be in accord with the historical development of the Privy Council itself; and I hope that those who approach the matter with an open mind may, for the reasons which I am about to give, agree with my conclusions. The Court is commissioned by the Crown to hear any appeals that are made to it for lack of justice in the spiritual courts. This is a principle which the Archbishop says must not be lost sight of and, he adds, it is the first and governing consideration.

There are, however, several useful reforms which I think without much statutory assistance could have been long since introduced, although they would not have dealt with what is regarded by so many people as the vital position of the present jurisdiction of the Privy Council.

On a former occasion I dealt at some length with two of them. I propose therefore on this occasion, after briefly describing the constitution and jurisdiction of the Courts other than the Privy Council, only to summarize what I think could be done. As far as possible I shall avoid making reference in detail to Acts of Parliament, Orders in Council and Rules of Court which, while of advantage when speaking to a body of lawyers, might perhaps prove a little tiresome to those who are listening to me to-day.

The Consistory Court.

I will begin with the Court of first instance, namely, the Consistory Court of the Diocese which is presided over by the Chancellor of the Diocese who is appointed by the bishop and holds office for life. This is the court in which all proceedings relating to the clergy begin. Broadly speaking, proceedings in the Consistory Court relate either to the granting of faculties, to matters of doctrine, ritual and the ceremonies of the Church, or to the shortcomings of clergymen in the moral sense. No proceedings of any kind can be instituted without the consent of the bishop of the diocese. This is called :

The Bishop's Veto.

The veto is a matter of great importance. It meets us at the outset of any contemplated procedure in the Consistory Court. It has existed in its absolute form since 1840. Should it be maintained? Or should any parishioner be able, as in the civil courts any citizen is able, to have unfettered access to the courts of the Church if he have a grievance which he thinks should be redressed? It is said that the veto should long ago 'have been swept away; its retention has been one of the fruitful causes of injustice and scandal.'

Three great commissions have considered this initial problem — two Royal Commissions, of 1883 and 1906, and the Church Assembly Commission of 1926. All three have arrived at different conclusions. I am for no change in the law in this matter. I think the veto should remain as at present, mainly on the ground that the Bishop's Veto is the only protection which the clergy have from malicious charges and prosecutions and from being involved in useless and oppressive suits.

I think it preferable to preserve the Bishop's Veto rather than to allow a suit to be started with liberty to the defendant to apply to have the proceedings stayed before Trial.

It is said that there may be cases of real importance where the bishop is wrong in refusing to allow a suit to be started. I refer, for example, to the refusal of Dr. Temple, when Bishop of London, to let a complaint that a new reredos at St. Paul's Cathedral was idolatrous be tried in the Court of Arches under the public Worship Regulation Act, 1874. No bishop was more strongly determined to prevent ecclesiastical litigation than was Dr. Temple. His refusal landed him in the King's Bench Division, where Lord Coleridge thought that the Bishop's reasons were bad and that the question ought to be tried. That decision was, however, reversed by the Court of Appeal, and the House of Lords finally held that the discretion of the Bishop being absolute, his decision could not be reviewed. I trust that to-day the majority of people will think that Dr. Temple was right.

Assuming now that the bishop's consent is obtained and the suit started in the Consistory Court. Notwithstanding its long history and the great traditions behind it, is that the best tribunal in which it should be tried? That depends, I think, upon the nature of the suit.

Varied Nature of Suits.

If the suit has reference to doctrine, ritual, or the ceremonies of the Church, then I say 'Yes,' and I suggest no change, though I am not averse to the recommendations of the 1883 Commission, namely, that in these cases the bishop himself should sit with a legal and theological assessor. I think, too, the suggestion made to me with regard to the actual procedure in the Consistory Court, that use should be made of a summons, analogous to the originating summons in Chancery, for the determination of the question at issue, is a good one. Such proceeding by originating summons has been a boon to trustees and others who needed guidance and protection in matters of doubt. It removes any flavour of hostile litigation while obtaining the required decision.

If, however, the suit has reference to the moral shortcomings of the clergyman, then I say 'No,' mainly because many of the

learned chancellors of the various dioceses, while eminently fitted by their training and knowledge of ecclesiastical law to decide about the granting of a faculty or questions of doctrine or ritual, are by that very training unfitted to preside and act single-handed over a quasi-criminal court where the guilt or innocence of a person charged with a grave moral offence is at stake.

In this matter I venture to think that the passages about the Consistory Court in the Report of the 1926 Commission do not show a sufficient, if indeed any, appreciation of the great difference in the class of cases which come before the Consistory Court.

It must be remembered that much of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts has, since the sixteenth century, been abolished by statute or lost by transfer to the temporal courts — for example, the transfer in 1857 of divorce and matrimonial causes to the Divorce Court, and of testamentary matters to the Probate Court. Crimes such as bigamy and incest, formerly punished exclusively in the ecclesiastical courts, are now dealt with in the criminal courts of the country.

It would therefore be not wholly without precedent if suits in connection with the moral delinquencies of the clergy were transferred to another tribunal having a wider knowledge of civil and criminal law and more fully trained in the admission, rejection and sifting of evidence than the chancellor of a spiritual court is likely to be. What then should the tribunal for this class of case be, if not the consistory court of the Diocese?

The Assize Court and Quarter Sessions have been suggested, or that the issue should be referred for trial to the Divorce Court presided over by a judge with special professional experience in these matters. In either case it is pointed out that a jury would be available; indeed, a jury was strongly recommended so long ago as by the Report of the Royal Commission in 1832.

I do not myself favour any of these suggestions. Although the Commission of 1926 makes no reference to what I am about to propose, it can hardly have overlooked the machinery which is ready to hand and could be utilized with very little statutory assistance. There is no difference in a moral offence whether it

be committed by a layman or by a man in holy orders; though no doubt guilt is more serious and more damaging to the community in the one case than in the other. In both the evidence is the same, and the cases should, it is suggested, on principle be tried by the same tribunal. This, however, is not I think feasible in practice. For the trial of these cases I would suggest the tribunal set up by the Benefices Act, 1898, as being eminently suitable.

Court under Benefices Act 1898.

The court under this Act — an Appellate Court it is true — is to consist of the Archbishop of the Province and a Judge of the Supreme Court. It is a Court of Record, sits in public, and at any hearing the legal rules of evidence shall prevail. The matters which come before it on a refusal by the Bishop to institute to a benefice are, it seems to me, precisely the matters which now come before a Consistory Court for decision after institution, *e.g.* grave misconduct or neglect of duty and evil life which by its conduct causes grave scandal concerning a clergyman's moral character.

Then again, under the Ecclesiastical Duties Measure 1926, to this court, and not to the Consistory Court nor to the Provincial Corut, is left on appeal the decision of whether ecclesiastical duties have been inadequately performed owing to the negligence of the incumbent.

It is true that the provisions of this Measure did not go so far as many people thought and indeed hoped that they did. The considered judgment of Mr. Justice Talbot in the case of Lindsay *v.* the Bishop of Carlisle shows quite clearly that the question of whether it is in the interests of the parish that the incumbent should continue to be the incumbent is not a question which can be decided under this Act. Some people may consider it desirable that the powers of the bishops and other ecclesiastical authorities should be strengthened in regard to that matter. But, as the learned judge pointed out, it would be nothing less than a revolution in the status of the clergy and the management of the affairs of the Church of England, if this policy were to be introduced without explicit legislation making clear a definite policy of compelling a clergyman to give up his benefice for reasons to which he is not now amenable.

A strong Church Assembly Committee reported on the 25th of October, 1932, that the Benefices Ecclesiastical Duties Measure (1926) urgently needed amendment, altogether apart from the judgment referred to. The defects in the measure I do not propose to call attention to, because I am trying to limit myself to the constitution of the courts and not to the matters which they have to decide. So far as I know, nothing effective has been done in consequence of the Church Assembly Report of the 25th October, 1932. All I will say is that any amendment of that measure, either along the lines of the report or otherwise, should provide that the tribunal to decide questions arising under any amending act should be that set up under the Benefices Act 1898.

With great respect to the 1926 Commissioners, it seems to me that they have not fully considered the qualifications of this Court. At all events I can find no evidence in the report that they have done so. I think that confidence in the trial of all cases other than those relating to doctrine and ritual would be increased if the jurisdiction were transferred from the Chancellor of the Diocese to a court akin to that which I have just described. A Bishop could of course sit with the Judge in place of the Archbishop if that were desired. I think there should be an appeal to the Judicial Committee; and of course the alternate right of appeal to the provincial Court which at present exists under the Clergy Discipline Act 1892 would be abolished.

I will now pass from the Courts of first instance to the

Appellate Courts of the Province.

I hold the opinion that an appeal from the Consistory Court should no longer be heard by a single judge, namely, the Dean of the Arches, or the Official Principal of York, but should be heard by a court of three judges consisting of two Diocesan Chancellors with the Dean of the Arches presiding. I cannot think an appeal from one judge to another is good in principle. For example, an appeal from a County Court judge or indeed from any judge is not to a single judge of the High Court but to a Court of Appeal consisting of three judges.

This is not the first occasion on which I have ventured to put forward these proposals in connection with the Consistory Courts

and the Appellate Court of the Province, and so far I have heard no dissentient voice raised against either of these two suggestions. Indeed it may not be out of place to mention that a leading article in the *Times* some months ago commended both of them to serious consideration by the leaders of the Church.

Now let us suppose that the suit has been disposed of by the appellate court, strengthened as I suggest by the addition of two Diocesan Chancellors, and the defeated litigant desires to take the case farther, to the last tribunal of all. In civil cases this means to the House of Lords, but in ecclesiastical cases the final appeal is, and since the Reformation always has been, to the Crown, termed by the Archbishop the supreme fount of justice in the realm.

The Final Court of Appeal.

It is inevitable that when reviewing the ecclesiastical courts as a whole, one must discuss the reason why 'thousands of clergy with strong lay support refuse to recognize the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee.' The Church Assembly Report of 1926 states that the vindication and enforcement of law in the Church of England cannot be secured, unless a change is made in the present constitution of the final court, and thereafter the Report indicates how the final court of appeal should be constituted.

I spoke earlier of those who listened to His Grace at the Summer Session of 1926, but those who have studied the address in print and the report which His Grace was presenting will, I think, bring away from that study the feeling about the Archbishop that, had he continued to follow his first chosen profession of the Bar, he would have reached the same eminence in that profession as he has done in the Church. Here let me say — and I say it with great respect — that His Grace is far too good a lawyer as well as ecclesiastical statesman not to make it plain beyond question that the ultimate appeal must be to the Crown. He regards the appeal to the Crown as the most important, the most difficult, and the most crucial part of the whole problem of the reform of the church courts. That principle is emphasized in more than one phrase of the Archbishop's address. Indeed he begged the Assembly to keep clearly and firmly in its mind that fundamental principle.

I do not share the view of those who regard the Church and the State as two independent organisms. I agree with Burke that in a Christian commonwealth the Church and State are one and the same thing, being different integral parts of the same whole. It seems to me that the idea of looking upon the State in England as secular and the Church alone as sacred or spiritual is wrong. It is a dangerous road to travel. It leads to the disestablishment of the Church which I think, on the contrary, should be maintained.

Disestablishment would, it seems to me, leave the Church at the mercy of conflicting parties and the whole position would be disastrously weakened. This is a matter I must not pursue in this paper, but it is I think necessary to state it in connection with the ultimate appeal to the Crown. This appeal would clearly disappear if the Church were disestablished; as indeed would all the Church Courts as we know them. The Disestablished Church in Ireland (1869) and the Disestablished Church in Wales (1918) had each of them to face the problem of the Church Courts of their Disestablished Church. How they dealt with them is historically interesting: but I must not wander into that field of information now, and indeed I trust it may not become necessary to do so. We are concerned with the Courts as they are to-day.

The ultimate appeal to the Crown being admitted, there next arises the question, by whom is the Crown to be advised, and is any alteration desirable either in the composition or in the procedure of the Committee which advises His Majesty in Council? A study of the whole history of the relationship between Church and State leads me to the view that no change, so long as the Establishment continues, is called for.

Further, I doubt if it is in the true interest of the Established Church that any change should be made. I cannot bring myself to think that the recommendation of the 1926 Commission—that the Privy Council should be bound without question to adopt the majority opinion of the Archbishops and Bishops—would be acceptable; nor do I think that Parliament would accept it. It is true that the Commission brushed aside the proposal for the creation of a new spiritual court to which appeals from the Court of the Province might go, and indeed I think

they were wise in so doing. But is not the recommendation of the 1926 Commission as nearly identical as anything can be with the setting up of the new spiritual court which the earlier part of the report does not see its way to recommend?

I venture to think that for us ordinary Churchmen it would have been convenient and helpful if the report of the Ecclesiastical Commission of 1926 had clearly defined the present constitution and functions of the court which it is proposing so radically to alter. It is common knowledge that ignorance and lack of information give rise to misapprehension and suspicion. The more accurate information that is available about a given problem before a solution of it is attempted, the better.

For example, I find no direct reference in the Report of 1926 to the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, nor any reference at all to the part which the bishops can now take under clear statutory provision on the hearing of ecclesiastical appeals in the Privy Council. The names comprising the Church Assembly Commission show how weighty a body were the Commissioners. They must have been well aware of the part which, as matters stand, the bishops can take in appeals heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but it seems to me that numbers of Church People, and indeed many of the leaders of the Church, do not fully appreciate what that part is.

Again, there is an Order-in-Council made on the 28th November, 1876, to which I find no reference in the Report. This Order was made at a Council Meeting held at Windsor for the purpose, over which Her Majesty Queen Victoria presided. It was made on a representation presented from the two Archbishops, the Bishop of London, the Lord Chancellor and others. The Order provides that in every ecclesiastical case about to be heard before the Judicial Committee, a summons shall be issued to the Archbishops and Bishops to attend as assessors according to a rota, and there is a provision that no case shall be heard before the Judicial Committee unless at least three of such assessors are present. It must be remembered that to churchmen less well informed than the commissioners, the Windsor Order-in-Council may well be unknown, and I venture to think it would have been of advantage to draw attention to it in the Report.

I cannot conceive of a stronger committee to advise the Crown than the judicial committee so constituted. If need be, it could be reinforced as recommended in the Royal Commission of 1883, with the power of consulting the Archbishops and Bishops in exactly the same way as the House of Lords now consults the judges of the land upon specific questions put to it for its opinion; it could be bound so to consult them on the demand of any one or more of their number present at the hearing of the appeal.

Origin of Judicial Committee.

Let us consider for a moment how the present jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee came into being. It arose as a result of the Report of the Royal Commission of 1832 which recommended the transfer of the functions of the High Court of Delegates (the supreme tribunal for ecclesiastical appeals from 1559 to 1832) to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. That report, which, with the evidence leading up to it, will repay careful study, had the support of all the leaders of the Church of that day. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Durham, and the Bishop of St. Asaph, signed it.

There would seem to be some confusion in the minds of otherwise well-informed people about the jurisdiction of the Privy Council and how it arose. For example, it is contended by a member of the House of Clergy, in a letter which was published in the *Times*, that the substitution of the Privy Council and its Judicial Committee in place of the Delegates was the repudiation of a concordat between Church and State; it was, he argues, an interference by the civil power with the Reformation Settlement, 'perhaps even a breach of the Magna Carta.' The essence of the objection of the English clergy and laity to the Judicial Committee is stated to be 'the total lack of any commission from the Church to the Privy Council to hear appeals.' Surely that member of the House of Clergy should have been well aware that the Report of the Royal Commission of 1832, when recommending the transfer of the Appellate jurisdiction to the Judicial Committee, contained the two following sentences:

> 'We have no hesitation in assenting to the expedience of removing that jurisdiction to the Privy Council'

and

> 'The Privy Council, being composed of Lords spiritual and temporal, seems to comprise the materials of a most perfect tribunal for deciding the appeals in question.'

How then can it be said that the jurisdiction of the Privy Council was forced upon the Church by the State? The Archbishop of Canterbury and the three Bishops who signed the report showed that the leaders of the Church welcomed it. The reasons which led them to do so seem to me still to hold good. Legislation followed upon the recommendations of the report. As previously stated, such legislation was amended in 1876 and, as so amended, it is the law to-day. The leaders of the Church in 1832, and again the leaders of the Church more than forty years later, left no doubt as to their views on the subject.

It has been objected that the presence of the ecclesiastical assessors is of no great value, but I dissent entirely from this view. I have before me a judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and I see that the Lord Chancellor and three law lords were present at the hearing. With them were sitting four bishops as ecclesiastical assessors. The judgment delivered by the Lord Chancellor contained the sentence :

> 'It is a source of satisfaction to their Lordships to find the views which they entertain are shared by the Right Reverend Prelates who have been good enough to give them their assistance upon this occasion.'

It can scarcely, I think, be fairly contended that the ecclesiastical assessors, equal in number as they were to the lay law lords, did not take a real part in the hearing of the case, and a real part in the protection of the Church. In a matter of doctrine or ritual I cannot believe that any decision as to the advice to be given to the Crown would be reached without the most careful consideration of the views of the ecclesiastical assessors. They are indeed there for the purpose of giving them.

Principles guiding Privy Councils.

It is of vital importance that the principles upon which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council proceed shall be understood. Its decisions are alleged in the 1883 Commission to be sometimes dictated by considerations of policy rather than of

pure law. Nothing can be farther from the truth. These principles are clearly stated by the Committee itself in the judgment in Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter. I take one sentence from this judgment:

> 'This Court, constituted for the purpose of advising Her Majesty in matters which come within its competency, has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought in any particular to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Its duty extends only to the consideration of that which is by law established to be the doctrine of the Church of England, upon the true and legal construction of her Articles and Formularies.'

Does not this definition of the functions of the Judicial Committee go a long way to meet the submission of the 1926 Commissioners that 'in a judicial Court what matters is not policy but fact and law'? It would indeed be dangerous if any court had the power to determine what *ought* to be the doctrine of the Church of England.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council represents the earliest and most ancient of our judicial institutions. The jurisdiction of the King in Council — undoubtedly the earliest exercised by the sovereign — was the origin of all the courts of justice in the realm. Lord Hale called it the 'common mother' of all the great courts which are now united in the High Court of Judicature.

It is the first duty of the sovereign to see that justice is administered to all his subjects. This duty was naturally exercised in council, and hence the jurisdiction of 'The King in Council.' It was not, I think, in its origin a jurisdiction regularly appellate. It was a jurisdiction to see that justice was done and to prevent a failure of justice.

In a learned work on the subject, a statement is made that:

> 'The claim to hear final appeals in matters ecclesiastical is preeminently one of the original prerogatives of the Crown and, as such, naturally exercised by the King in Council.'

Before the Reformation the appellate jurisdiction was finally exercised in this country by the Pope, sometimes in Rome and sometimes by papal delegates sitting in this country for that purpose. When the appellate jurisdiction of the Papacy was abolished, the statute of Henry VIII carefully vested this jurisdiction in the King in Chancery in order that it might be exercised by royal instead of papal delegates.

As a humble student, I venture to think the opinion of Lord Cairns to be right when some years ago (1872) he expressed in the House of Lords and declared his view to be that the Judicial Committee is not really a judicial body but is merely — as a portion of the Council — a consultative assembly. It does not deliver judgments like the House of Lords. It humbly advises His Majesty.

I must not be further tempted to say more of the history of the Privy Council, but with regard to the present Judicial Committee to the Privy Council, the objection raised by the report is not due, to use the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, 'to dislike on the part of any section of the Church of the decisions which in the past it has reached.' It is composed of the most eminent lawyers of the day and, as I have already mentioned, when ecclesiastical appeals are to be heard, the Archbishops and Bishops are to be summoned to attend as assessors according to a rota, with the provisions that no appeals shall be heard by the Judicial Committee unless at least three of such assessors are present.

If I had to choose between the Recommendations of the 1883 Commission and that of 1906, I infinitely prefer the former, but I agree with the view in the 1926 Report that existing decisions in the shape of advice tendered to His Majesty may be open to reconsideration: they are indeed so open now, without any special provision for the purpose.

> 'The rule of finality applicable to decisions of the Privy Council in relation to rights of property is not equally binding as regards decisions which relate to ritual and ecclesiastical practice and depends to some extent upon the accuracy of historical investigation.'

So said the Judicial Committee in 1892.

It appears to me, from the reasons I have given, to be wrong that 'thousands of clergy with strong lay support' should continue to refuse to recognize the jurisdiction of the Privy Council. I see no ground for such refusal. The transfer to the Privy Council is now more than a hundred years old, and on two occasions — at intervals of forty years — has such transfer been approved by the leaders of the Church. Speaking in great submission, I regret that the Committee of 1926 should have adopted this phrase, which they took from the Report of the Commission of

1906. A phrase of that kind — even if true at the time — should not, I feel, have been perpetuated by repetition twenty years after it was written.

With the utmost deference to the Commissioners, I respectfully dissent from the recommendation that where, in an appeal before the Final Court, the question arises what the doctrine, discipline or use of the Church of England is, the opinion of the majority of an assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces shall be binding on the court as to what the doctrine, discipline or use of the Church of England is. I agree with the views of the Bishop of Durham when he says that he cannot bring himself to think that the substitution of ecclesiastics for judges as the final interpreting authority of the Anglican standards is likely to serve the interests of justice, and I adopt his trenchant sentence :

> 'Such a final Court as the Report recommends appears to me quite incompatible with the Royal supremacy as it has been hitherto understood in England, and indeed only to be defended on the mediaeval assumption of the spiritual incompetence of laymen as such.'

Is it presumptuous to enquire whether the problem of the final Court of Appeal is really so difficult, considered in the absence of some acute controversy and when the atmosphere is calm? While no one respects more than I do the principle stated by the Archbishop upon which the objection to the present Court of Final Appeal is based, I feel that such principle can be pressed too far.

Publicity in the Press.

Returning for a moment to the Courts of first instance, may I devote a word or two to the important question of the publicity given in the public press to the evidence and proceedings in the case of trials where the moral conduct of a clergyman is under consideration? It is a subject which is well within the knowledge of all general readers. I have abundant evidence that the suggestion I make meets with wide support.

I think the limit which now prevails in reports of cases in the Divorce Court should be extended to cases in which a clergyman is accused of immoral conduct. I think it is unfortunate that when the House of Laity and the House of Clergy, after full

discussion approved of this limitation, that the House of Bishops should have been equally divided when that House came to vote. It is to be hoped that when next the question comes before the Church Assembly, the House of Bishops, in a matter of this kind, will be disposed to follow the views of the Houses of Clergy and Laity. I venture to think the feeling of the House of Clergy and Laity, to say nothing of the view taken by the House of Commons nine years ago, might well have carried more weight than it did in the House of Bishops. There was no spiritual issue involved.

I know it is said that truth and justice are more important than either public morals or the convenience of society, but I cannot think that either truth or justice would be put in jeopardy should the recommendations of the Church Assembly Committee be adopted and a measure following the 1926 Act put upon the Statute Book. Indeed I think grave scandal and damage to the Church would be avoided.

I am perhaps the more entitled to express a hope that the recommendations of the Church Assembly Committee in this matter will become law because of the part which I took, when in the House of Commons, in helping Sir Evelyn Cecil, now Lord Rockley, in the promotion of the 1926 Act relating to the Divorce Court. It is right to say again that that Act, a private member's bill, only reached the Statute Book in its present form through the parliamentary skill and persistence of Sir Evelyn Cecil; any person with experience of piloting a private member's bill of this character through the House of Commons will not think I am using the language of exaggeration when I say what I have said. Apparently, however, the difficulty of getting a measure through all three Houses of the Church Assembly, even with a strong public opinion behind it, is even more difficult. I trust the attempts of those who think as I do on this matter will be renewed at an early date.

Finally, is it too much to hope that before the consideration of the great questions — possibly including that of disestablishment — which must arise when the Church and State Commission Report is published, there should be introduced into the Church Assembly a measure to give effect to the two modest

reforms in the Consistory and Provincial Courts which I have ventured to think are possible at the present time?

To summarize very briefly the main points of this paper, I would say:

(1) Let the Veto of the Bishop be undisturbed and remain as at present.

(2) Let the final appeal as at present be to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as constituted by the Appellate Jurisdiction Act 1876.

(3) Let the jurisdiction of the Consistory Court in all matters other than those relating to the granting of faculties and questions of ritual and doctrine be transferred to the court established under the Benefices Act 1898.

(4) Let the appeal in all ecclesiastical matters dealt with in the Consistory Court be not from that court to a single judge, but to a court consisting of three judges, *viz.*, two Diocesan Chancellors with the Dean of the Arches or Official Principal presiding.

(5) Let the provisions of the 'Judicial Proceedings' (Regulation of Reports) Act 1925, be made to apply to all proceedings where a clergyman is concerned which are of the nature defined in that Act.

PUBLIC WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

ITS IDEALS AND PROBLEMS

By the Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D., Stanton Lecturer at Cambridge 1931-4.

ENGLISH is to-day so much the medium of communication between educated Europeans, let alone citizens of the Transatlantic countries, that the Anglican Prayer Book (with its overseas variations) has actually increased in importance even within the last seven years. It is freer and more linked to Scripture than some Lutheran forms, and represents the best-known compromise between using a liturgy not understanded of the people, and having no fixed liturgy at all. To consider its underlying principles has thus become much more than a mere domestic affair. Moreover, everywhere in the Christian world to-day there is an interest in worship which was formerly absent. As Friedrich Heiler has said: 'Throughout the whole of Christendom (and not in one section of it alone) there is a liturgical movement.' Much has been written and spoken in appreciation of Henri Brémond's advocacy of worship as cleansing the soul from egoism and self-centredness, and so purifying and ennobling the character.

But this is not the limit of our concern. Outside the Christian commonwealth, as well as inside it, people are considering the meaning of leisure, and how to occupy it, and it is quite plain that they like spending their leisure in crowds. The defence of contemplation as a proper way of spending at any rate part of one's leisure hours is being set forth, not only by the Roman Catholic, Mr. E. L. Watkin, but also by persons who have no Christian background at all. The idea of devoting at least a portion of one day a week (if not more) to contemplative surrender to a supreme ideal is common ground between atheists like H. G. Wells and orthodox quietists like Frank Buchman. This really implies some form of worship, using the word in its proper sense as 'worth-ship,' the bestowal of value upon what is supremely valuable.

The theory of worship is therefore no mere denominational affair, but has assumed a public importance; and a totalitarian state may easily issue sooner or later an order for public worship, imposed upon all citizens by a fresh Act of Uniformity. As this has been tried before, a survey of the ideals and circumstances connected with such a previous attempt should be of general interest.

The ideals, set forth in the various prefaces to the English Book of Common Prayer, are familiar to most of us, and if I summarize them, it is only in order that we may begin our survey in proper form, not because I credit any one of us with ignorance of their main features.

(1) The original preface of 1549 now stands second in the unrevised book. It avows that the object of the compilers was to restore the public and orderly reading of the whole of Scripture, and to provide a common form of worship in the vernacular; to ensure the orderly recitation of the whole Psalter; to simplify the rules by which the services were varied from season to season; and to furnish a uniform use for the whole realm. Great stress is laid upon the importance of people understanding the language and intention of the services, and the words 'plain' and 'easy' are reiterated.

(2) In addition to this we have some important remarks as to ceremonies, which were placed at the end of the 1549 book, but transferred to the beginning, and put next to the original preface in 1552, presumably for the purpose of emphasis. In this section the importance of a common order and discipline is stressed, and reference is made to the difficulty of satisfying those whose conservatism makes it

> 'a matter of conscience not to depart from a piece of the least of their ceremonies,'

and those who

> 'be so new-fangled that they would innovate all things, and so despise the old, that nothing can like them but that is new.'

It is laid down accordingly that

> 'Christ's Gospel is not a ceremonial Law (as much of Moses' Law was) but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit; being content only with those ceremonies which do serve to a decent order and godly discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified.'

On these principles it is explained that some ceremonies have been abolished as wholly superstitious, others as liable to be turned to superstitious uses; it being impossible to maintain order or quiet discipline in the Church without some rubrics at least. But again it is urged (1) that those which have been retained for their present utility are not to be esteemed equal with God's law, (2) that they be not dark or dumb ceremonies, but are so set forth that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve, (3) that the regulations are not intended as a reflection upon the practices current among other Christian peoples, since it is held convenient that the citizens of every country should

> 'use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition.'

(3) Finally in 1662 a very long main preface was affixed, which bears obvious marks of the period of restoration in which it was drafted, and which seeks to justify the revision of the Tudor book, emphasizing the importance of moderation, 'such as we find to have been used in the like case in former times.' It is this preface which contains the famous statement of the *via media* as the ideal of the Anglican Church: 'to keep the mean between two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation.'

The occasion which called for this statement would seem to have been the Savoy Conference, at which suggestions for the amendment of the Book were set forward by radical Protestants, some of which were 'of dangerous consequence as secretly striking at some established doctrine, or laudable practice of the Church of England or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ, or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain.'

The principles guiding the Revisers of 1662 in their work are of no small importance, since we may believe that they have set the standard for subsequent revisions, and not least for that which came almost to fruition in 1928. The Revisers say that their general aim was not to gratify any one party, but to preserve peace and unity; to procure reverence, and to excite piety and devotion in worship; to remove any occasion for just cavil or

quarrel against the Liturgy; to improve the rubrics and make them clearer and more explicit, and to express more properly words or phrases of ancient usage, in terms more suitable to the language of the present times, and to remove such expressions as are of doubtful signification or otherwise liable to misconstruction (including faulty translations of Scripture); and finally to increase the number of occasional prayers and offices, so as especially to meet the demands of changing social circumstances, such as naval and colonial expansion, and the growth of an earnest radical Nonconformity which disliked infant baptism.

> 'The growth of Anabaptism through the licentiousness of the late times crept in amongst us.'

I have dwelt at some length upon the contents of these prefaces, because they express far better than any words of mine could do the ideals of worship of the Anglican Church as Reformed. I need hardly remind my hearers that the attempt was made both by Tudor and Stuart sovereigns to impose the form of worship so constituted upon all citizens, who were held liable to penalties if they used any other, or none at all, or absented themselves from attendance at public worship. Nonconformists in England and Covenanters in Scotland were in fact in much the same position in the seventeenth century as the Confessional Churches are in Germany to-day.

I must now pass to some passages from the Preface affixed to the Deposited Book of 1928. They run as follows:

> 'Since 1662 there has been a change almost beyond belief in the facts and modes of English life. Far and wide the country has yielded place to the town, and the growth of knowledge has given to millions instead of thousands new means of earning their daily bread. Old barriers are broken down, as by sea and land and air men are brought ever closer together. The England of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has become the mother of a great commonwealth of peoples still linked together in a common loyalty. With the rise of numbers has come also a shifting of power from the few to the many. Not less strange to the men of the age of Elizabeth or of Charles II would have seemed a model of government in Church and State which guards instead of mistrusting liberty of thought and speech, and would set no narrower bounds to freedom than those which belong to brotherhood and fellowship. In religion as in all else truth is not prized less highly because it is no longer fenced on any side.' [That is now unfortunately only true of a section of Europe. It is far less the case than when the words were written.]
>
> 'We are living in a new world: it is ours if we are true to the faith that is in us, to seek and make it a better world.'

'It is by prayer and service that we may hope to do it. But we dare not think that a Book of Common Prayer fitted for the seventeenth century can supply every want of the twentieth: the marvel is that it calls for so little change. [This is a matter of opinion.] New knowledge and new ways of life bring with them new customs and forms of speech unknown before. As men think upon God's wonderful works unveiled before them, and are quickened afresh by the power of His Spirit, their hearts and minds frame for themselves new prayers and thanksgivings and seek new occasions of worship. It is the duty no less than the right of those who bear the burden of a great trust to see that plain needs are plainly met, and that the Book is still in our day, as of old, understanded of the people. The task is no light one, nor has it been lightly undertaken. We know that to some we shall seem to have changed too much, to others that we have allowed too little freedom. It was not otherwise in earlier times. At least we have made no change for the sake of change, and denied, as we believe, no freedom which may be rightly claimed.'

A good deal of this (all perhaps save one sentence) might have been written by a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union, and it reads like part of some article appearing in one of its monthly journals. In fact its terms might lead the reader to expect a much more daring revision than is to be found in the pages which follow. Justice demands that allowance should be made for the impediment of ultra-conservatives, and that tribute should be paid to the courage which sought to sanction extempore prayer, which revised the occasional offices, and enriched our ordinary devotions at a number of points, including the somewhat belated legalization of hymns by the insertion of the important new rubric (on page 65). Yet it was disappointing even to moderate advocates of revision to find the Psalter and Lectionary, and the Epistles and Gospels, so little changed; meagre recognition given to post-canonical Christian prose (as though forsooth the inspiration of the Holy Spirit ended with chapter xxi of the Apocalypse); and little re-shaping of the Proper Collects, the 'Our Father' being still subordinated to the sub-Christian 'Zeus Pantocrator'; and one feels also that the words of administration in the Communion office still fall short of helping the congregation to realize the significance of that august occasion.

But more than this must needs be said. A guarded tone in the language of the preface leads one to doubt whether the account of the changes which have created the modern situation is complete and adequate. Something has got left out.

Obviously there is no explicit reference in this final preface to balance that made to Anabaptism in the preface of 1662. Something has, perhaps accidentally, been hushed up. The story of the changed world is not frankly told. A really outspoken account would perhaps have contained some such sentence as this: 'We have allowed another order of Holy Communion, which although not so necessary when the former book was compiled, yet by the growth of Anglo-Catholicism, through the licentiousness (?) of the late times crept in among us, is now become necessary'!

In other words, the really complicating problem in the adaptation of the Book of Common Prayer to changing needs within the Church is not the new world of science nearly so much as the neo-Catholic revival.

What is the real truth about the latter? I do not think it has always been faced as fairly as it might have been.

Catholicism to-day is a form of Christianity quite as much as the Protestantism so clearly and vividly described by Karl Heim in his recent Tübingen lectures; and it must be reckoned as such. It is not entirely a haphazard growth, but is based upon a principle, inclusive rather than exclusive, which is at least as old as the time of Gregory the Great, and which was applied by him through Augustine to the conversion of the English. It may be that Keyserling is right in his suggestion or hint that a certain syncretistic religious process has produced Catholic Christianity in Europe and Hinduism and Mahayana Buddhism in Asia, and that in spite of the differences between them, their resemblances are explicable on anthropological or psychological grounds. It may well be that the fusion of their characteristic features, *i.e.*, a philosophy for the sophisticated which is taken as read by the multitude, and a hospitable inclusiveness with regard to all kinds of cults, especially those of female divinities — it may well be that the combination of these features is the product of a special hybridization of the dark white peoples of the planet with other races. But these contentions are open to dispute. What is quite certain is that in Catholicism as we know it, whether Eastern or Western, we have the results of a treaty effected between a specially prophetic and apocalyptic religious faith of Semitic origin and the existing

religious cults of a pagan population which at the time was of rather a mongrel character, but predominantly Mediterranean. This treaty, though effected in Europe, has made a compromise possible almost everywhere on the planet between prophetic Christianity and the natural religions of mankind, and the results may be seen in the ripe experience and rich devotional treasures of the continental Church, quite as much as in a certain lamentable lowering of standard to which all mass-Churches are prone, and in a too great readiness to bless and tolerate survivals from sub-Christian religion, whether in Mexico or in Madras.

Nevertheless it is an error to ignore what Catholicism may have to contribute to the great Church of the future, and the re-discovery of this possible contribution seems to have been one of the main events of the nineteenth century history of the Church of England. It is not enough to call Catholicism 'paganized Christianity'; the latter (as we see to-day) may just as easily be an over-nationalized form of Protestantism. Doubtless future generations may doubt the wisdom and criticize the enthusiasm of those who have been busy since 1833 reviving and re-introducing what are called Catholic practices within our Church. But their success has proved that they were in many cases meeting a need, and in others supplying a want: and the result has been that in order to satisfy the religious cravings of the entire population, the revisers of 1928 have felt bound to make more room for Catholic practices than heretofore, since these practices, though repugnant to some, are agreeable to others, and in varying measure plainly form congenial accessories to the approach to Almighty God on the part of many Christians.

It is also evident that there is a marked difference between Northern and Mediterranean Catholicism, not only in England, but also in Germany. Tractarianism bred a much more austere type of religion than popular Latin Christianity; and the restrained Sarum use has been strongly evident in recent restorations of old and adornments of new sanctuaries. It is by no means certain that a Catholicism of the future will necessarily follow the Italian pattern, but may take its tone from Lambeth, Munich, or Rotterdam, and may contain far less worship of the Magna Mater, and far less of the celestial insurance policy element, deplored by Fr. Jerome, than it does at present.

Catholicism to-day is increasingly popular, not only because it has come to combine the discipline of Imperial Rome with philosophy and pageantry, asceticism, saintliness, and absence of puritanism, and is congenial to those who believe in a dictatorship of life; but also because much neo-Thomism seems intellectually respectable, while the fundamentalism of some Catholics is certainly not more absurd than the fundamentalism of some Protestants, and is far more romantic and picturesque. This is the case, whether we agree with it or not.

Let us try to think clearly about the situation. The plain purpose of Anglicanism in the matter of worship has been to make public devotion not only dignified and reverent, but plain and easy, and most certainly *relevant* to the condition of the real world in which the worshippers themselves have to spend most of their time, restricting the amount of ceremonial in accordance with the prophetic principles of the Gospel.

Now what are the historical facts? There appear from the earliest days of the Christian movement to have been two main types of public cultus, (*a*) the Temple type, (*b*) the Synagogue type; and both have sought to relate the worshipper to the Worshipped in a relationship of λογικὴ λατρεια or reasonable devotion. Type (*a*) is concerned with the sovereignty of God, and thinks of the temple as the palace of the Grand Seigneur, to whom his subjects bring their offerings, just as feudal tenants might bring their first fruits and dues to their chieftain. It is common to Babylon, Jerusalem and Athens. The supreme sacrifice is the sacrifice of human life, and this is offered either in actuality as in ancient Mexico, or by proxy, as among the ancient Jews, or among Christians by the one full perfect and sufficient sacrifice of the God-Man Jesus Christ, whose offering is *re*-presented in the mystery of the Mass, every time it is offered. The significance of this sacrifice is dependent upon the conception of the ethical relations prevailing between God and man.

Type (*b*) is more concerned with the wise parenthood of God, and thinks of Him as omni-present, and therefore approachable in homely and domestic surroundings. The synagogue itself is only an enlargement of the large sitting-room of a house, and the cultus consists in a common meal, and in meditation, discussion, or exhortation, with law and prophets as the written

medium. The temple type of worship may still be assumed as persisting somewhere in the dim distance, and related to the weekly meeting much as an Easter Communion is related to the hearing of a weekly sermon; but the service is pre-eminently a 'Word of God' service, and can persist quite easily without the temple type as its occasional appendix. The fact is that the synagogue type of service, while still recognizing man's duty of sacrifice, holds that the best λογικὴ λατρεία possible to man is that of a character transformed and moulded by the Tôrah;* and Micah VI is still the best summary of it. It does not necessarily involve, as we shall see, the idea of a vicarious or mediatorial expiation of guilt. Yet it is confined neither to Judaism nor Christianity nor even Islam. It is to be found in Buddhism, where the devotional exercises of Siamese, or of Japanese Zen-Buddhists,[1] seem directed in precisely the same way towards the production of a certain controlled type of human character, *and this process of character-formation and renewal is in itself cultus*, directed in Buddhist circles towards a possibly impersonal but eminently pragmatic Deity, the Universe or the Whole (spelt with a capital W) which deals out rewards and punishments with just and unswerving accuracy.

Thus, while according to Christianity it is quite clear that there is a reasonable service which is due from man to God, the method of performing this service is determined in its various sub-divisions by the theological pre-suppositions, and has sometimes inclined to the one type, sometimes to the other.

Those for example who stress the sin of man are influenced as regards their worship by the amount of emphasis which is laid upon it.

Supposing that mankind is believed to be wholly lost and ruined and reprobate. Then no act of worship which it can offer could be of any value at all to God, no deed of any sort which it does can be meritorious. In this case man can only hear God's Word declaring pardon to the guilty, and grace abounding to sinners; and worship will be the glad though submissive response of the individual in daily life. Preaching houses may be in use,

* It is therefore much more individualist than the temple-type, which deals rather with men collectively.

[1] As seen and described for example by Prof. J. B. Pratt.

but the temple-type of worship will be non-existent.

Nevertheless it is possible for this evangelical Christianity to transform itself fairly easily into Catholicism, since central in its theology stands the atonement, the sacrifice of Calvary; and thus the worship of the Christian community can express itself in the corporate and symphonic *re*presentation or pleading of God's act through Jesus Christ, expiating man's guilt, and propitiating the wrath of God. A sacrificing priesthood is existent or non-existent according as it is liked or customary, and may be abolished as expensive and unnecessary without any real abandonment of the idea of a propitiatory or expiatory sacrifice due to God from man, or provided by God to compensate for the helplessness of fallen man.

Catholicism obviously provides by way of worship the temple type of sacrificial service. Continental Protestantism and a great deal of British Nonconformity provide the synagogue preaching house type.

The Church of England to an increasing degree provides both. Yet in both the idea of an atoning sacrifice stands central, though it could easily be eliminated from either.

The general exhortation prefixed to Morning and Evening Prayer defines the objects of coming to church as five in number.

1. To render thanks for the great benefits given us by God.
2. To set forth His praise.
3. To hear His Word.
4. To confess our sins.
5. To ask those things which are requisite as well for the body as the soul.

The idea of each service being a repeated or re-presented or pleaded sacrifice is here abandoned or slurred over. It is to be assumed that 'thanks and praise' include thanks and praise for the one full perfect and sufficient sacrifice, but this is regarded as finished and complete, needing no application other than its acceptance by the individual *Sola fide*. As Professor Burkitt was never tired of pointing out, the Communion office as drafted by Cranmer implies only one reiterated sacrifice, that of the sacramentally purified and strengthened congregation. Nevertheless the idea of the necessity of the *original* sacrifice for atonement, propitiation and expiation is still retained; and

it becomes a pure matter of private judgment as to whether its application ought to take one form or another ('we condemn not other nations').

I omit of course any detailed reference to the distinction between the Catholic and Protestant views of the Fall of Man, which involve different conceptions of nature and grace, because in spite of its importance there is no time to deal with it here. Suffice it to say that it involves the questions whether *any* act of man at all can be *meritorious*, and whether man can or ought to co-operate with God. The Church of England in her formularies answers 'No' to the first, and 'Yes' to the second question.

But what is the present situation? The authorities may busy themselves conscientiously with the reform of both types of service, but sooner or later they must inevitably find themselves face to face with a deep theological issue, which divides them from the people for whom they are seeking to make provision.

The real situation is best described as that of an almost total disappearance of the idea of sacrifice from the mind of the modern human being — at any rate in the propitiatory sense; so that worship becomes neither the recognition nor the representation of such a sacrifice in a certain spot at a certain time, but rather the offering of daily life in general as a reasonable return to God for having created us. Fall, Sacrifice, Atonement, these are notions which for weal or woe are absent and irrelevant. The natural religion of mankind seems altering, and if natural religion alters, what is going to happen to Christian worship?

Thus the religiously-minded youth, who finds his parish matins uninspiring, with its long Old Testament psalms and lessons, and limited and reiterated prayers, suddenly perhaps discovers an outlet for pent-up feeling in a sung eucharist at a neighbouring church. Yet when he enquires more closely into the theory which lies behind such a service, he finds it less in the doctrine of the sacramental Presence of the Living Jesus, the Pioneer of Life and Friend of Youth, than in a sacrificial doctrine of an angry Deity Who has had to be propitiated by the death of Jesus:

> 'For lo, between our sins and their reward
> We set the Passion of Thy Son, our Lord.'

This doctrine of God seems to him strangely unlike that taught by Jesus, especially in the parable of the Prodigal Son; and it damps his enthusiasm for what he nevertheless feels to be very beautiful worship. Perhaps he even turns away from it. How are the revisers to reform the theory of this Eucharistic temple-worship so as to make it acceptable to the Christian conscience of our youth? I believe it to be true that his objection is partly the result of a misunderstanding of the meaning of the Eucharistic sacrifice. When Mr. Ivan Young in the recent Anglo-Russian symposium (p. 128) speaks of 'God's eternal movement of sacrificial love towards His creation,' he is expressing the truth much more wisely than some of our formularies do. Yet whatever misunderstanding there be, it must needs be remedied, even at the cost of reframing our existing consecration prayer.

Or again. An intelligent girl who has been trained in Roman Catholic practices, disliking Romanism, comes to her (Evangelical) parish church. There she finds an expiatory theory of atonement, not unlike that implied in the Mass, preached to her. She is puzzled and disappointed; and is still further dissatisfied at the uncritical attitude adopted towards the Scriptures.

Or in the third case, a lad from a good secondary school and provincial university reads his New Testament and then attends his parish church. In spite of all the efforts of the revisers of 1928 he still listens to many things which his intellect tells him are false.

The problem of the authorities is therefore in these days an extremely complicated one. They are conscious that the purse-strings and policy of Church councils are still largely controlled by conservatives, *but also that vast numbers of not ill-disposed persons are not attending church at all, and that to a great extent this is due not so much to the failure as to the actual success of some of the principles attributed to our Lord.*

Any intelligent person perusing the Synoptic Gospels is bound to be struck by the emphasis upon praying in secret, and upon avoiding vain repetitions. Even the attendance of our Lord in the temple and His association with His friends in domestic ceremonies like the Kedūshath Ha-yom were more than balanced by His continual retirements for solitary prayer,

and His emphasis upon the inwardness of true spiritual religion.

On the other hand the authorities quite rightly feel that *some* symphonic acts of worship not only enrich man's life, but are an essential part of his λογικὴ λατρεία in presenting himself through Christ as a holy and living sacrifice, body and soul, and that our Lord never condemned such acts. How are they to make provision for them? It is not a mere question of astute administration. They can go if they like in the direction indicated by Catholics or in that advocated by Evangelicals. They can seek to please either the Attorney-General or the Seven Years' Association. Yet all the while the fundamental questions are avoided: 'Why is the idea of a propitiatory sacrifice and of expiation for guilt so largely disappearing from the minds of the populations of the world? Ought it to be brought back? And if it goes, how can one retain the Mass or the Gospel Sermon? How can one indeed have any church-going at all?'

The Protestant answers: 'Let the Mass go. It is unnecessary. The Gospel Sermon *is* the elevation of the Host.' But here comes the double difficulty that apparently (1) to many an objective form of worship is still appropriate, and many who wish to practise adoration are not patient of sermons. (2) Many who would like the one or the other do not seem to be attracted by the essential ideas of traditional Christianity.

I would urge therefore that the supreme need of our time is to re-think the idea of man's relation to the Self-Existent Being, and to reshape our public worship less with an eye to compromise than with an eye to the true doctrine regarding God and Man, and then to consider how man in various different countries normally expresses himself in worship, that we may adapt his local customs to the service of a true theology.

At present the dilemma is difficult. Quite obviously the ground within the Church is divided between the two types of worship, the temple and the synagogue, and although some prefer one and some the other, yet it appears that people can be trained to an intelligent participation in either. Of course herd-suggestion and habit must be allowed for; but on the whole it seems harder to teach eucharistic devotion in some places than in others. Yet in England neither type can be said to be provided in a form 'plain and easy to be understood.' It is said

that the Mass is easy to understand and follow; but I am not sure that it is, unless one instinctively holds a certain view of the nature of Deity, or deliberately omits reference to some of the official doctrine connected with it. I am not sure that in the form, let us say, in which it is taught in the Roman Catholic Penny Catechism it does not become less and less relevant and understandable, the more one reads the alleged teaching of Jesus. But I am not sure that this is not equally true of many sermons on the Atonement.

In a recent essay[2] upon the devotional life in Judaism, Rabbi Starrels draws the well-known distinction between 'the Christian view' of the world as 'an evil place, with man a sinful creature, so that it is through a special saviour that salvation becomes possible'; and the Jewish view (yet not exclusively Jewish) which looks upon the world as essentially good, and quotes with approval the words of *Genesis*, where God looks out upon the world that He has fashioned and pronounces it 'very good.' Not that the Jew minimizes the evil in the world, but despite all its evil, he holds to his faith in its infinite possibilities for betterment.

> 'As for man himself, far from ascribing to him any condition of original sin, Judaism regards man as a creature of original virtue, and prescribes for recital in daily prayer the words: "The soul which Thou hast given me is pure." We are children of God, and He has made us equal to our needs. Evil is real, but we can prevail against it. The world is sound at the core, and Judaism does not look upon man as doomed. He is not a "lost" creature, whose only chance for salvation is through a special saviour. Man must become his own messiah, and work out his own destiny.'

Such a view is correctly labelled by Christian theologians as Pelagian. Yet the curious fact remains that it is surprisingly like not only the view of the general Epistle of James, but also like the view presented by the teaching of Jesus in what has been called the pre-Caesarea-Philippi period of His ministry. If the latter half of the Gospel narrative did not exist, and we only knew such records as the Sermon on the Mount and the parable of the Prodigal Son, we might indeed set down our Lord as a Pelagian teacher.

Yet the full story of our Lord not only includes the Cross, but shows that from the very outset the earliest interpretation of His career made it central. It was the Cross in which the first

[2] *In Spirit and in Truth*. A Jewish-Christian Symposium.

Christians were interested rather than in the Sermon on the Mount. Not only St. Paul (though he pre-eminently), but practically all early Christianity saw in the crucifixion and resurrection the really important 'new thing.' It was the failure of Jesus to fasten His doctrine of God and man upon the world of His contemporaries without the giving of Himself to be broken and slain which altered men's estimate of mankind, and turned it in the direction of a theology of salvation. St. Paul may be the spokesman of this altered view, but we can hardly say that he imposed his doctrine upon a society which did not want it. On the contrary, his genius seems to have lain in making articulate what others apparently felt. We may speak of him as 'essentially twice-born,' as 'our first great cataclysmic convert'; and of his doctrine as 'Paulinism'; but all the time we are shirking the real issue: 'Why did Jesus choose the cross; why did He have to die?' Was not His doctrine so true and innocent and beautiful that mankind ought to have lapped it up like milk? Why is it that once-born Judaism has failed to expand? Is it not possible that when man comes to God and desires to have fellowship with Him, the more he gets to know, the more his sense of his own inadequacy and infirmity gets the better of him, so that worship can only be sincere when it is utterly humble, and only free from despair when it worships God as one Who so loved the world that He sent His only-begotten Son to rescue it from wasting itself?

Yet it must be admitted that to modernize the existing forms of worship in the sense of re-translation cannot succeed in drawing back the alienated multitudes to the Churches of Europe, unless it be preceded by a conversion of the multitudes away from a Pelagian outlook.

What makes most of our Church worship irrelevant and unreal is not the falsity of all Christian Theology, nor even the use of Latin, but the excessive confidence of man in himself. Man with his multitude of discoveries and inventions, his conquest of earth and sea and sky, his supreme trust in his ability to construct a planned society, cannot endure a Christianity which is not at heart Pelagian, and therefore he attaches himself to the earlier portion of Christ's teaching, and ignores the Cross. For this purpose he needs no Liturgy and no Mass, no evangelical ser-

mon and no hymns about the Atonement, no priest and no Gospel minister. But he may even go further and not call himself a Christian at all, treating the teaching of Jesus with interest and esteem, much as we do that of Socrates. I am not at all sure that the view of many Christians is not surprisingly close to that attributed to Jews by Rabbi Abelson of Leeds.[3]

> 'Our striving after holiness is accounted to us as holiness. This is our atonement. God takes us as we are, and we require no intermediary to secure the Divine grace for us.'

This of course is not orthodoxy. It is theism without the distinctive Christian doctrine of a supreme redeeming act of God. The point is, is it or is it not true? If it is false then it is before all things necessary to convince people of its falsity by reasonable argument which will commend itself to every man's conscience. Official Christianity has so far treated it as false, and has insisted that by far the greater part of our church-going is necessary to salvation because without it we cannot secure the application to our needs of that mediating atonement wrought by Jesus Christ. Either the audible word of healing must be applied to our souls by the Sermon, or the visible word must be offered to our souls in the Sacrament as their heavenly food and medicine.

In fine, the supreme problem before the Church to-day is not the modernizing of words and phrases, the legalization of musical interpolations and extempore prayer, or the addition of new occasional devotions, to make things more comfortable for those who already believe—(the sort of reform in which Liverpool Cathedral and St. Martin's-in-the-Fields act as the most efficient pioneers)—but the fundamental problem: 'What is the true relationship of man to God, which church worship is intended to express? Is man to-day entirely on the wrong track? Is he too self-confident and full of optimism? Or too disheartened and failing in nerve? Is Paulinism the correct interpretation of the office and work of Jesus, or is it not? Is man to be won to worship by persuading him to return to the old ideas of his nature and of God's attitude towards him?' Or are we on the fringe of some

[3] *The Jewish View of the Atonement,* in a composite volume produced by the Society of Jews and Christians, pp. 82 ff.

great new creative outburst of prophetic religion, which will stress again the sunnier elements in Christ's teaching, and refill our churches with people whose hunger for God is but little related to any sense of being lost, guilty, or depraved?

I doubt it. Yet I cannot help feeling strongly that an over-emphatically twice-born theology is reactionary, and just as irrelevant to the facts of life as one which is pre-eminently optimistic, and that, as in Germany to-day, it will invite hostile experiments, which may very easily be bad experiments. I do not get good marks from my Lutheran friends for saying this, but I believe it to be true. We shall be wise in this country to stick to our traditional Anglican principles, and not to be swept away in one direction or another by any tide of neo-Calvinist pessimism or totalitarian ὕβρις, but to try to think soberly of ourselves, though not more highly than we ought to think. (Is it unjust to say that the English liberal religious school could stand a slight infusion of 'existential thinking'?) In this way we shall develop a public worship which will appear *relevant* to Everyman, because it will be based upon what Everyman, in moments when he is not swayed by panic or hysteria, feels to be true. God deals with us as sons and daughters, not as criminal slaves or automata. He calls us to stand upright upon our feet, that He may speak with us, and not cringe or grovel.

Yet all, even though sons and daughters, have sinned and come short of the glory of God. We need to bow our heads with shame as we stand before Him, and reflect upon the pettiness and cruelty, the pride and self-sufficiency, the prejudice and narrowness, which so repeatedly hinder us from being ready and efficient instruments in the purpose of God.

I wish that time permitted me to enlarge upon the psychological importance of devotional habits in forming character and in renewing our apprehension of religious truth day by day; but I would say this much, that the present generation in its impulsiveness does not, I think, sufficiently recognize that importance, and suffers accordingly. Spasmodic and irregular church-going is accompanied by spasmodic and irregular practice of Christian virtue. Our forefathers, with all their 'Victorian hypocrisy,' knew better than to neglect the wisdom of the Church in training her children; and their virtues and staying-power

were consequently better-grounded.[4]

One more word. I do not think the authorities realize keenly enough the burden that is often put upon the individual parish priest in his fierce and exacting but unadvertized trench-warfare against the forces of spiritual evil in town and country. Through the handling of Prayer-book revision by persons of a certain type of education and social environment, he ofttimes finds himself like a man who is left to tackle a deadly enemy with one hand tied behind his back (or in more modern terms) with a faulty or badly-designed pattern of machine-gun. The ideal of Anglican worship was (as we have seen) that it should be plain and easy, so as to convince and convert the outsider and edify and assist the simple. Only too often to-day is it evident that these aims are not being achieved. I am sometimes almost in despair at the Bible lessons I am expected to read to working-class folk at their one hour's weekly worship, and at the Psalms (even selected) which I have to ask them to sing. Converted and sophisticated individuals may be able to appreciate these offices, but they are as Chinese to the average working-man, and very often as dry bread to the *dévot*, and they leave too many good excuses open to the unruly for breaking away from the practice of public worship altogether. Biblical criticism has greatly embarrassed 'Word of God' services, and I do not myself think that Barthian preaching can possibly supply the remedy. The alternatives seem to be to revive the traditional form of the Mass, as many do, or else to become a free-lance, which does not harmonize very well with the vows and oaths taken at ordination. Our leaders should therefore return with speed to a courageous enrichment of our service-books, unless we are to lose ground still more than we have done in the last five years.[5]

Our inherited principles are sound enough. What we need is a fresh application of them, based upon an honest, well-grounded, and forward-looking theology.

[4] For a more detailed discussion of this point I must refer my audience to what I have written elsewhere recently. (*Doctrine of God,* concluding chapter. Modern Handbooks of Religion, Vol. 7.)

[5] I have been wisely reminded that probably the best way for this to be accomplished is for private experiments to be made in drafting. These, if found sufficiently satisfactory as the result of tests, can be sanctioned by the bishops and ultimately presented for legal authorization.

CONFLICTING IDEALS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Rev. L. B. Cross, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford; Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall.

THERE are so many conflicting ideals in the Church of England, that it is difficult to know where to begin our consideration of them. However, as these conflicting ideals have led to the formation of a number of well-defined movements within the Church, I propose taking each movement in turn, and examining what are the ideals characteristic of it, and how, and why they differ from those of other movements. It is, however, most important that, in our consideration of these movements, we should not forget that solid body of, call them Central or Broad Churchmen, or whatever you like, which forms the backbone of the Church of England. To adapt a metaphor from Christopher Dawson's *Religion and the Modern State*,[1] our Jerusalem is not all suburbs; there is a residential centre to the city, in which many of those who live in the suburbs work. Our ideal should be to make all work together in the city; but, we must, for the present, return to the suburbs.

Terminology descriptive of the movements varies, but, for the purpose of discussion, I shall use the three terms Catholic, Evangelical and Modernist. I am well aware that there are Catholics and Catholics, Evangelicals and Evangelicals, Modernists and Modernists; this fact will become more patent as we proceed.

Catholics are the heirs of the great Tractarian movement of the nineteenth century. It is as well to remind them of this, because they are now inclined to forget their Victorian ancestry and toy with the idea of a Roman one. I am not going to trouble you with a history of the Tractarian movement itself or with its doctrine, for I have no doubt that you are all familiar with them; what I want to do, however, is to draw your attention to the main ideals characteristic of its heirs.

[1] p. 109.

Catholic doctrine is based on an essentially dualistic conception of God and man. It really begins with the Fall, not with the Incarnation, and this colours its whole theology. Whatever God intended His relation with the world to have been had there been no Fall, Catholics do not say, but after the Fall God removed Himself from man, or rather, no more came to him. This alienation and the consequent need for redemption continued to exist, till, by a special Divine Act of a particular kind in history, God manifested Himself in the flesh in the Person of Jesus Christ. This Divine Act in history had as its purpose the reversal of the Fall, and the making of a New Creation. The centre of, and the means whereby this New Creation was accomplished was Christ; those who were in Him were the New Creation.

After His Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, the Church became the centre of the New Creation, and the dispenser of the newly-given Divine Life. This it mediated to its members through its Sacraments, in which the central drama of Christ's life, namely His death on the Cross, is continually to be re-enacted. The Church became the extension of the Incarnation, the real Body of Christ, the centre from which alone God's recreative activity comes. Because Catholicism believes that the Church is the vehicle of the Divine Life, and that that Divine Life can only be mediated to the believer through the Sacraments ministered by episcopally ordained priests in the true line of Apostolic Succession, its main means of self-expression is through worship. Through this and this alone can man be reconciled to God and made a participator in the Divine Life. God, however, transcends man, and the nature of man is other than the nature of God. The dualistic conception persists.

True to the logic of its theology, the Catholic attitude towards the Bible is that of fundamentalism, and in consequence it is not prepared to accept the results of modern Biblical scholarship with an open mind. Scientific scholarship, likewise, it is only prepared to tolerate, so long as it does not conflict hostilely with Catholic ideas; human knowledge is wholly human. Its attitude towards it is that of the Encyclical Pascendi (1907). Consequently its logical position in relation to the Bible is that it should be retranslated into Eskimo or some other little-known

language. The Church's teaching contains 'all things necessary to salvation.' The ideal worshipper is the most ignorant. It represents a return to the old theocratic type of Catholicism best exemplified in the Roman Church; this is one of its initial mistakes, for 'the genius of the Christian society is democratic, not authoritarian';[2] it is a religion claiming absolute authority trying to spread itself in an age of intellectual freedom.

We may now turn to the second movement, Evangelicalism, the direct heir of the great Evangelical movement inspired by the teaching of the Wesleys and Whitefield in the eighteenth century. It represents the opposite extreme to Catholicism, but the two have a great many features in common. It starts, like Catholicism, with the Fall, and adopts the same dualism between God and man. Like Catholicism, it interprets the Incarnation as a special Divine Act of a particular kind in history. It adopts the same attitude towards modern Biblical and scientific scholarship.

But there are also fundamental differences between the two movements, and these are centred in the question of the way in which the benefits accruing from the Incarnation and the Atonement are mediated. The Catholic, as we have seen, claims that they are mediated through the Church, the extension of the Incarnation; the Evangelical, that they are mediated through the Person of the Risen Christ by reason primarily of His death on the Cross. Evangelical theology is inseparably wedded to a transactional view of the Atonement. By this one act God, through Christ, offered salvation to all mankind; He made literally 'a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world'; He restored, at any rate potentially, for every man the status he would have had, had there been no Fall.

These benefits of the Atonement are to be appropriated by the individual, not through the sacramental system of the Church, but through conversion. The Church is not the Body of Christ in the sacramental sense, but in the sense that it is the body of believers in Christ through whom He works. The Sacraments are symbols: Baptism of a regenerated life (Evange-

[2] F. R. Barry: *The Relevance of the Church*, p. 51.

licals to be consistent ought to practise adult Baptism), and Holy Communion of His Passion.

Conversion, however, is really only the first step in the Evangelical's Christian life; he has thereby been put on the road to salvation, there is a long pilgrimage ahead. Sanctification follows by good works and the operation of the Holy Spirit. The Evangelical's foremost means of obtaining sanctification is by good works, not through worship, hence the numerous educational, missionary, and social activities which have been started by Evangelicals. But Evangelicalism does not neglect worship; this takes the form primarily of hearing sermons, saying private and public devotions, and singing hymns mostly of a soteriological and eschatological type. Whereas Catholicism is theocratic in its theology, Evangelicalism is essentially individualist; whereas in Catholicism the supreme authority in religion is the Church, in Evangelicalism it is the Bible interpreted in the light of the individual's moral and spiritual conscience.

These two extreme forms of traditionalism had a part to play in an age of virtual feudalism, but a new age has dawned. It has brought with it a new way of looking at things, an age which is unparalleled in history excepting perhaps by the age when Hellenic culture first made its impact on the Orient and produced the Wisdom Literature.

The dawn has come, not by a miracle such as was visualized in the poetic imagination of the writer of the account of the battle of Beth-horon — Modernists do not claim that God has rained down thunderbolts from heaven for them to throw at traditionalists — but naturally. As Catholics and Evangelicals can point to their respective 'clouds of witnesses,' so can Modernists. They have their link with the past: their 'cloud of witnesses' includes a long line of great saints, philosophers, poets and scientists, men who have hazarded their lives for the truth, some unto death.

The Modernist movement differs fundamentally from the Catholic and the Evangelical in one essential respect. It does not base its theology on the doctrine of the Fall, it believes that God breathed into man 'the breath of life; and man became a living soul' whose true nature it is to know God and do His

will. It believes in evolution, and in consequence has no room for a conception of God and man which is that of dualism. True knowledge cannot be of more than one kind, therefore, all that we know of truth is from God, and of God. There can be no such thing as sacred knowledge and secular knowledge.

From this, fundamental consequences follow; the Fall not having taken place, there can be no need for a special Divine Act of a particular kind in history to reverse it. Hence the Modernist interpretation of the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Church, the Sacraments, the Bible, and the relation of the individual to them must differ in all respects from that of the Catholic, and in most respects from that of the Evangelical. But Modernists do not deny them. Modernism is not negative only, but positive as well.

The centre of its belief *is* the Incarnation. The Catholic and Evangelical emphasis on it as a Divine Act in history is one which Modernism not only accepts, but insists on. Where it differs from them is in its interpretation of the significance of the Divine Act. It sees in the Divine Act, not only the Self-revelation of God to man in Jesus Christ, but also a revelation of the true nature of *man*, not as a fallen creature, but as a Temple of the Living God. To quote our President, 'Christ reveals the nature of God unknown in its fullness before.'[3]

We have seen that Modernism cannot accept the doctrine of the Fall, — that human reason and divine reason are mutually exclusive, that man and God were permanently alienated during the period covered by Genesis to the beginning of the New Testament (for this is the logic of the traditionalist view): Modernism conceives of God as progressively revealing Himself to man and in man. The Old Testament is the *human* account of that progressive revelation, so is the New Testament, and so is all history, all philosophy, all science.

But this revelation is not progressive in the sense that there is an even uninterrupted revelation of God, with no setbacks, and no bright spots. No; Modernism affirms that God's self-revelation is given in the measure in which men individually and collectively at different times and in different places are able to apprehend it. Among men Christ stands out above all who had

[3] W. R. Matthews: *God in Christian Thought and Experience*, p. 71.

gone before and all who have followed, for Christ knew God. Truly God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.

But this reconciliation was not a transaction whereby God snatched men from the devil, nor was it achieved through the infusion of the Divine Life into the Church through its restricted channels, but by the manifestation of the Divine Love for men, a Divine Love which when manifested had to suffer death rather than compromise with falsehood.

By the Modernist attitude towards the Incarnation and the Atonement, its ideals in relation to the Church must be governed. The Church is, or rather should be, the society of those who find in Christ the fullest satisfaction of their highest ideals. Its primary function must be that of teaching; through the ear by the proclamation of Christ and the Gospel in the light of modern knowledge, and by music; through the eye in the symbolism of art and action; through the moral conscience in love of humanity; and above all, through the spirit, in prayer and meditation. The Church is, to quote from Canon Barry's new book, 'the witness to God's reign in earth and the foretaste of its realization.' Modernism claims its share through the Church in the fulfilling of Christ, 'the Spirit of Jesus is the only asset of the Church, but without the Church Christ is not fulfilled.'[4]

Modernism must, then, differ from Catholicism and Evangelicalism, but the accusation that it teaches another Gospel, is false; it does not teach another Gospel, but it does teach another interpretation of the Gospel. Its primary difference from them, as we have seen, lies in that it is not based on the doctrine of the Fall and a cleavage between God and man; all other differences follow from this. It believes, not that Christ broke down the 'middle wall of partition' between God and man, but that He showed that there really was no wall, excepting the one which human blindness imagined.

So far we have dealt with the ideals of the three main movements within the Church of England, we must now turn to those which form the offshoots of two of them. If Modernism has done nothing else, it has forced some of the traditionalists to see that their position was intolerable. Hence we find that many of the heirs to the Evangelical movement of the eighteenth and

[4] *op. cit.*, pp. 52, 55.

nineteenth centuries have reinterpreted the tradition of their fathers, and, not ashamed but proud of their spiritual heritage, have called themselves Liberal Evangelicals; they are best exemplified by the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement. In the same way, though not altogether for the same reasons, some Catholics find that the traditional fold is too restricted, and have become Catholic Modernists.

Liberal Evangelicalism's ideals as expressed by A.E.G.M. can best be summed up by quoting from its own statement of its aims, a truly remarkable document when studied in the light of nineteenth century Evangelical ideals. 'It asserts its continuity with Evangelical tradition, which is to be identified with abiding principles and not with special views held in any particular period. These principles are, the direct access of the believer to God through the redemption of the Lord Jesus Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit; the unique authority of the Bible; the refusal to give to Tradition the same authority as that given to the Mind of Christ revealed in the New Testament; the high value of the Sacraments of the Gospel spiritually used and interpreted; the responsibility of every Christian to strive to win individuals for Christ and to extend the Church of Christ at home and overseas.

'It believes in progress under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; it stands for freedom of enquiry and study; it welcomes new knowledge as a gift from God; it believes in the ultimate synthesis between the results of the scientific approach to the universe and the facts of the Christian Faith and of Christian experience.

'It gladly welcomes the new light shown on the Bible by modern scholarship. It recognizes the progressive nature of the revelation of God in the Bible, but its final thought of Him is based upon the character and teaching of Jesus Christ; it does not regard as true any conception of God which is inconsistent therewith. It seeks to know the Mind of Christ concerning the Church—the Fellowship of all those who share His Spirit; concerning the full meaning of the Sacraments in that fellowship; concerning the psychological interpretation of our religious experience; concerning the union of simplicity and beauty in worship; concerning the racial, social and economic implica-

tions of His teaching, and the place of science, art and literature in the life of the Christian. It desires that its experience, thus continuously re-interpreted by means of fellowship in prayer and study, may be shared as widely as possible by its own generation.'

These words speak for themselves : they illustrate the amazing capacity of Evangelicalism to adapt itself to circumstances. They form a succinct summary of the ideals of the old Evangelicals minus their fundamentalism. Truly here is a right hand of fellowship for the Modernist to grasp.

The other offshoot of traditionalism, the Catholic Modernist movement, is best illustrated in the book, *The Development of Modern Catholicism*, by W. L. Knox and A. R. Vidler. To quote from the introduction :

> ' The purpose of this book is to trace the steps by which the Tractarian revival, beginning as a reacton against the growth of Liberalism in the nineteenth century, has in the course of a hundred years adapted itself to the profound changes which the period has witnessed in every department of human thought.' [5]

The main steps are *Lux Mundi*, *Foundations*, Spens' *Belief and Practice*, and Dr. E. G. Selwyn's *The Approach to Christianity*. The movement has been greatly influenced by Roman Catholic Modernism, and by Karl Barth.

Forced away from the fundamentalist position by modern Biblical scholarship, and especially by that of the school of Form Criticism, it is essential to their thesis that we can know nothing about the person of Jesus from history ; but that does not matter. To quote the authors' words :

> ' So far as the scholarship of the Catholic movement is concerned the criticism of the New Testament has become a matter of historical study, not a battle for the central issues of the faith.' [6]

Criticism then, having done its worst, and the old basis of dogma having gone, something must be substituted for the historical authorities, the Bible and the Fathers which the old form of Catholicism appealed to. Here the authors, falling back on the philosophy of Pragmatism, put in their place as the final court of appeal in all matters of authority Christian religious experience. The fundamental difference between the *essence* of what history narrates and the *form* in which it is narrated is

[5] p. vi. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 266.

the key to their interpretation of Christianity. The authors see in the Christian's experience of the spiritual value of the traditional dogmas which are based on Old and New Testament history and ecclesiastical tradition the *essence* of the Christian facts; the history itself is only the *form* in which the *essence* is portrayed. 'We mistake the rationalization of the Christian experience in the form of theology for the reasons which lead us to believe.'[7] The old Catholicism worked *out from* history, the new Catholicism works by the analytical method *in to* history.

Christian experience, then, is the new authority for the truth of Christianity. In words quoted by the authors from A. E. Taylor's *The Faith of a Moralist*:

> 'In the experience of the Christian community of an unique form of life mediated through the human personality of Christ we have a living *auctoritas* for the claim that the Christian life is not an illusion.'[8]

Again:

> 'In its power to bring redemption and sanctification through faith in Him it can speak with the absolute authority of a divine message committed to its trust.'[9]

Such, in brief and very inadequate outline, is the view propounded by Catholic Modernists. It is not of course the exclusive property of Catholicism, but lends itself to adoption and adaptation by Evangelicals and Modernists. In fact it opens up new vistas which may end anywhere; on the one hand, as its promoters suggest, in true Catholicism, and on the other in Buchmanism, its American cousin with an Oxford accent. What is going to be its effect upon Anglo-Catholicism? There can be little doubt that from a Catholic point of view it can be used to vindicate the older *form* of the Catholic ideal. Catholics by their religious experience centred in the Sacraments, and in the dogmas and traditions of their faith, will be able still to claim that the Church is the extension of the Incarnation, the true Body of Christ, the society in which alone, not only religious experience, but the truth are to be found. To them it will remain the ideal, if not the only, Church. The doctrine of the infallibility of the Church can be made to follow from this by reason of their possessing an infallible authority, the experience of Christ in whom 'there has been a direct manifestation of deity in terms of

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 190. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 299. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 315.

humanity . . . the personal coming of the eternal into the order of time.'[10]

It is not my task to criticize this somewhat seductive attempt to get behind the results of modern scholarship and re-establish the old Catholic ideal. For the purpose of this paper it suffices for me to say that it, like its parent, is based on an ultimate dualism, and presupposes some kind of a doctrine of the Fall as do all Christian systems of thought which look upon the Incarnation as a Divine Act in an objective sense. Its whole philosophical basis is fundamentally different from and opposed to that on which Modernism has in the past been built up. However, Modernism is a movement, and may move in this direction; personally, I do not think it will. Whether or no it does, will depend largely on how much of the Catholic tradition is going to be kept as the *form* through which the *essence*, religious experience, is to be expressed. Are Modernists prepared to accept the cult of the Blessed Virgin because, as we say of the episcopacy, it is of the *bene esse* and not of the *esse* of Christianity? Are Modernists prepared to believe in an infallible Church when they become members of it?

A similar theory, but one which carries its ideals more into the realm of the practical, is expounded by A. G. Hebert in his recently published book, *Liturgy and Society*. This author, like those whom we have just considered, differentiates between the *essence* of dogma and its *form*; 'we can distinguish,' he says, 'between the essential content of dogma and the form in which it is expressed.'[11] There is a divine and human element in dogma, it is 'a treasure in earthen vessels.' 'The divine element . . . creates for itself a body out of human materials.'[12] Dogma expresses absolute truth: for it is a matter of God's truth, not man's.'[13]

But, unlike the Catholic Modernists whom we have been considering, he does not assign the place of primary importance in Christian dogma and worship to religious experience; he says 'it is false to the nature of Christianity to assign to religious experience the primacy.'[14] That place he assigns to liturgy. 'The

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 309.
[11] p. 90.
[12] p. 92.
[13] p. 247.
[14] p. 114.

Church bears witness to the world in various ways — by the lives of Christians, by their impact on social life, by sermons, books, wireless, by public manifestos, by personal example . . . But there is another way in which the Church herself speaks, more clearly, certainly and effectively than by the voice of her individual members. This is by the existence of the parish churches and the liturgy that is performed in them.'[15] In the liturgy, ideally that of the Roman type, the whole history of God's dealings with man as portrayed in the Bible and in pagan religions is summed up, and through it God speaks for all time; 'in the liturgy the past is apprehended as present, and Bethlehem, Calvary, and the Mount of Olives are brought into the *here* and *now*. Or, better, the liturgy is really enacted as in the heavenly places, and past, present, and future alike are seen *sub specie aeternitatis*.'[16]

The liturgy can speak then with the authority of God, not only because He has chosen that means of self-communication, but because of the Incarnation. Christ is the Fulfiller of all history. He is what both the Jewish and pagan religions were striving after. They were true religions, because they represent questions asked by God Himself in history. Christ is God's answer to these questions. Hence, as the Christian liturgy has elements drawn from Jewish and pagan sources as well as from Christianity, Christ the Fulfiller, God's Answer, is mediated to all mankind through it. The life of each worshipper becomes part of history.[17] ' Christianity is above all a Mystery; that is, a Divine Action through which God wills to save mankind and every individual, and exalt us to a participation in His Divine Life.'[18] ' Therefore it is necessary also that all history should be seen in the light of that which gives it meaning; and this is what is done in the Eucharist. The lives of worshippers at each Mass are part of history, and they themselves are conscious that the whole content of their lives is here brought into relation to God's redeeming purpose, and conscious also that the same is true of all the other lives which make up God's universal Church. Every Mass is therefore a Mass of the whole Church; and if it were possible for us to comprehend its full meaning, we

[15] p. 38.
[16] p. 69.
[17] pp. 59, 140.
[18] p. 132.

should see there, focussed in one point, God's whole redeeming work for all mankind, past, present, and future.'[19]

Here again, it is not part of my task to weigh the merits and demerits of this Catholic ideal. I must content myself with saying that, like the other Catholic Modernist view, it is based on an ultimate dualism and presupposes some kind of a doctrine of the Fall. Similarly, it is an attempt to get behind the results of modern scholarship and vindicate the *form* of the Catholic ideal, especially that of the Roman Church. Its claim for the infallibility of the liturgy is a claim for the infallibility of the Church which possesses the liturgy.

It now only remains for me to sum up. We are truly at the crossroads. In the midst of this conflict of ideals we must not ask, which is the true Church, but rather, how can the Church come true? 'The supreme issue of the new age is the victory or defeat of Christianity.'[20] Where are we going? Are the five great movements whose ideals I have tried to portray going hand in hand along the one great Highway, or is each movement going to take its own road, and are some going to remain where they are? There is no doubt that there is 'the deepest need for a society to revive within the state, which rules its life by spiritual convictions.'[21] We talk glibly about our 'unhappy divisions,' meanwhile the battle goes to the strong forces of secularism. Disunion if it means nothing else, means weakness. From a practical, as well as from a spiritual point of view, Reunion should be one of the first ideals which we attempt to achieve.

Along what lines are we to look for Reunion, Catholic, Evangelical or Modernist? Christopher Dawson suggests that there is only one way, the way to Rome; 'Protestantism, Liberalism and Communism,' he says, 'are the three successive stages by which our civilization has passed from Catholicism to complete secularism. The first eliminated the Church, the second eliminated Christianity, the third eliminates the human soul.'[22] We see signs that Anglo-Catholicism in its old and new forms is thinking the same way and drifting in the same direction. Rome has achieved many ideals of which we should take note. It is an international Church; it is a Church which is, at any rate

[19] p. 70.
[20] F. R. Barry, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 36.
[21] F. R. Barry, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 148.

superficially, at unity with itself; it has a perfectly worked out system of worship; it lays the strongest emphasis possible upon its corporate wholeness; its philosophy is a philosophy of the universe, not of theology. Roman Catholicism has a genius for doing the right things, but its reasons for doing them are almost invariably wrong. Anglo-Catholicism is in very much the same position. Can Modernism adopt the Catholic ideals? Personally, I think not.

Nor can it, even for the sake of Reunion, follow the way of the older forms of Evangelicalism. Evangelicalism is too individualist. It is true that 'there is no vital, developed religion which is not "personal" religion, and certainly there is no Christianity,' but we must remember also that 'because of the social nature of personality *all* "Grace" comes to men through societies.'[23] 'The extreme individualist interpretation of Religion is really the materialist interpretation of history dressed up in religious clothes.'[24] But there are many of the ideals of Evangelicalism which Modernists, like the modern Liberal Evangelicals, would do well to take note of. It also has a genius for doing the right things, but invariably gives the wrong reasons for doing them.

The great stumbling block in both cases, as we have seen, is that their theology is based on the Fall, behind which there lies a conception of both God and man to which a Modernist who is true to his ideals could never subscribe. The Church scented, though I do not think understood, the magnitude of the issue raised by Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*; the ultimate issue was somewhat obscured by the immediate danger in which the Bible stood. The doctrine of the Fall presupposes a God who is incompetent and who punishes man for that incompetence. Such a theology surely falls short of the lowest ideals of God and man. This to my mind is the centre of our problem. As R. D. Richardson puts it, 'is it only upon an entirely different idea of God (and I would add man) that Catholicism and Protestantism can be reconciled.'[25]

[23] F. R. Barry: *op. cit.*, pp. 57, 58.

[24] S. Tetley: *Has the Christian Church a Future?* p. 232.

[25] R. D. Richardson: *The Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England*, p. 65.

As I have said, Modernism can, if it will, learn a great deal from both Catholic and Evangelical practice, and this is especially true in relation to worship and evangelism; but it should be able to learn without selling its own soul. I believe that it is upon the *ideals* of Modernism that the new world is going to be built. Modernism has the new wine, and must put it into new bottles, the design of which may be similar to that of the old ones. Modern Catholicism's ideal of attempting to give, not only a new meaning, but a new power, to the old dogmas or liturgy is, in my opinion, neither practicable nor honest. Generations brought up under the guidance of the old dogmas, old traditions, old forms and ceremonies, may be able to accommodate themselves to it, but we must remember that we have to deal with generations now present, and yet to come, who lack that background, and who cannot be supplied with it. When we teach them we shall be expected to say what we mean, and to mean what we say. I have seen few things as distressing as the recent attempts made by some of the defenders of orthodoxy to answer Professor MacBride's challenge published in *The Times*. One can make a not improbable guess as to whom the average reader of *The Times* awarded the palm. The Church is not expected to be a Brains Trust, but is expected to face up to problems, and not reply to a challenge by quibbling. Modernism must translate its theology into a language which is intelligible to an age which expects intellectual honesty.

If Modernism is true to its own genius and its trust, it will form the rallying ground in the future for all those whose ideals are not satisfied either by traditionalism or pseudo-traditionalism. There are signs that both Catholics and Evangelicals can find a home with Modernism; they must be welcomed as colleagues and partners in the building up of the Church of Christ in England. Modernism must go forward looking to the future with courage, not looking back with suspicion. The Church, like Lot's wife, has in the past looked back all the time, and has become a pillar of salt, salt which has lost its savour.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich.

MY subject is the Church of England and other Christian Churches; that is to say, what is to be our attitude towards them and what the relations which should exist between them and us. Our answer must depend largely on whether we concede to these other Christian bodies a legitimate place in the whole Catholic Church of Christ or not. There are indeed two Churches whose right to such a place is unlikely to be questioned, however unsatisfying and erroneous some of the claims of, at all events, one of them may seem to be, the Church of Rome and the Orthodox Church of the East. So far as the Protestant Evangelical Churches are concerned, the Nonconformist bodies in our own country and empire, the position is not so generally conceded, the Lambeth Conference pronouncement of 1920 notwithstanding. The chief reason for hesitation concerning, or denial of, their position is that they do not accept Episcopacy or formally acknowledge the Apostles and Nicene Creeds, and some of them are perhaps doubtfully in accord with us on the question of the Sacraments. I propose before going further to say something about this, and particularly about Episcopacy, wherein the chief difficulty seems to lie.

What has our Lord to say about it, or indeed about the Church at all? Remarkably little; inconceivably little if He did indeed regard the Church as an integral part of His teaching and particular features of it, as this of Episcopacy, as essential to its true being. Almost the only relevant saying is the classical passage in St. Matthew, following St. Peter's confession, one of the outstanding marks in the story of the Gospels, having its echo in part (with the passage in the *Acts* to support it) in our rite of Ordination; but striking as this utterance is, its isolated character, cutting into teaching so different, with no previous explanation, no warning to point the way, makes some of us hesitate in accepting these words as just precisely the utterance

of Jesus Christ. They seem to reflect so obviously the matured conception of a later age. What term exactly did He use, translated '*ἐκκλησία*,' and what exactly did the disciples make of it? We may frankly accept the Lambeth declaration, 'We believe that God wills fellowship,' and recognize that this is present in Christ's teaching without going so far as to say that an organized Church was distinctly a part of His plan. Still less can we concede, on the basis of this statement, that Episcopacy is an essential note of it. We shall rather be ready to regard the Church as the natural outcome of a fellowship of His disciples, which He certainly initiated by calling to Him the twelve, with whom others were soon associated. In so far as the Church was the natural development of that beginning and a vehicle (necessary in some form as such a vehicle was) for the preaching of His Gospel and the establishment of His Kingdom, it may be said to derive in a sense from Him; but that is quite another thing from supposing that He brought into His teaching of His disciples the scheme of a Church, and that particular features therein possess the special authority of having been designed by Him.

Whatever teaching He gave of the things concerning the Kingdom of God outside His recorded sayings, there is nothing to support a theory that it might have been of quite a different character from what is recorded; there is everything to imply that it was of a piece with that. And could anything be less like the line of teaching given, in view of His opposition to the formal institutions of the Hebrew teachers and leaders and their elaboration of tradition based on authority, than a detailed system of organization for the body of His disciples?

It used to be explained that it was doubtless one of the things which our Lord told His apostles in the course of the forty days after His resurrection during which, according to St. Luke, He spoke to them the things concerning the Kingdom of God. But we are quite unable to accept as 'doubtless' things which rest upon so shadowy a foundation. It is hardly necessary to remind you how indefinite most of these origins are and how entirely the particular theory of an episcopal origin of the Christian Ministry has been displaced, notably in England by Hatch in his Bampton Lectures of 1880, and in our own day by Dr. Streeter in his *Primitive Church*. These have shown the ab-

sence of differentiation at first between ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι and the gradual development of the episcopal system; but the old theory has still far too much acceptance to make it needless to point this out again and again. This early history, whatever weight we attach to the actual process of development, prohibits the assumption that an episcopal form of government was actually designed and given to the Church at the beginning.

But if episcopacy did not originate in Christ's own teaching, it has been the traditional order since quite early days. It has been a Church so ordered which has carried the stream of Christian thought and life through the ages and of which we are the inheritors. Such a system has the worth and dignity that belongs to its antiquity and continued influence. Even if it arose naturally in the course of the development of the Christian Society, it nevertheless possesses a measure of authority on that very ground, and it has answered well. A line of development that fitted the circumstances so admirably may be said to possess in that fact Divine approval and to be in accordance with the Divine Will, even though it was not actually imposed by Christ and was rather the result of human adaptation of the Church's needs to the circumstances of the day. But it must be noted that this was in accord with the general system of human government in those ages, and that the modern idea of self-ruling communities has a bearing on Church government as it has on the administration of any other considerable group of human beings associated for some great purpose. We have no claim to the right of dictating to others who may find some other method more in accordance with their views of what constitutes a legitimate Church. To be in the main historic stream of Christian experience has, as it seems to us, clear advantages, and its order may still seem to us to possess a unique value, but we are not entitled on that account to assume that our order is the only right order and other orders are wrong. Moreover, if we may claim that a system of government, which followed on broad lines other systems current at the time, possessed the support of the common order of society at the time and had that measure of natural vindication, we can hardly refuse a like justification to a different system which has seemed more in accord with modern methods in other spheres. If indeed it could be shown that the

fruits of the spirit are so manifestly the possession of the episcopally ordered Churches that they give to their adherents a Christian character which other groups of professing Christians lack, there would be surer ground for advocating the real pre-eminence and necessity for episcopacy in a Divinely ordered Church, but this cannot be alleged with any pretence of proof. Alas, the historic Churches have too often shown conspicuous departures from the mind of Christ to afford us the testimony we should need on the one hand; while on the other, the non-episcopal Churches can point to centuries of Christian life as vigorous, consistent and fruitful as any that the episcopally-ordered Churches can show. Here, if anywhere, may be applied quite strictly the Lord's test, 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' and measured by that standard the non-episcopal Churches can give as adequate a witness to the Spirit's power as the episcopally-ordered Churches can do.

We who belong to the Church of England think that we gain from that allegiance not only in the strength of a great historic position, but in a life and order which has been tried through the ages and comes to us with a wealth of old association and a maturity of experience well worth inheriting from the inside. Moreover, it may well seem to us that such a Church has possibilities for influence on a bigger scale than we could find elsewhere, though we must probably admit a degree of rigidity in doctrine, a hesitation to accept new conclusions, an absence of elasticity in method which younger and differently ordered Churches may well possess. But precious though we believe this heritage of ours to be, we have no right to deny a like value to other systems whose members may deem that they have equal advantages on their side.

What does the Church of England say about it?

The Articles define the visible Church of Christ as 'a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance.' Nothing is here said about episcopacy as necessary to the constitution of the Church; nor do the Articles which refer to the ministry, — that which declares that ministers must be lawfully called and sent, that which accepts the ministry even though the character of the minister be evil, that

which approves the form of ordination. Although the Preface to the Ordinal considers the three Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons to have existed since Apostolic times and lays down the manner of admission into these Holy Orders, and the directions in the Prayer Book limit particular acts of ministry to those lawfully ordained according to the rite set forth, it is nowhere said that this ministry and its method of ordering are a necessary mark of Christ's Church, so as to determine our attitude to those bodies of Christians which do not possess it, or which follow some other method of ordering their ministry.

It may be said that the *due* administration of the Sacraments implies an episcopally ordained ministry. I am not prepared to admit that it does, though of course throughout the Book such a ministry and only such a ministry is in mind. In any case it is somewhat remarkable that a matter treated as of so much significance to-day should not be explicitly included in the Articles of Religion which do not take other things of importance for granted.

The Article about the Creeds is indeed more definite, as stating that they ought thoroughly to be received and believed, though here again is simply the statement of the Creed held by the Church whose Articles are being given. Though the bold assertion is made that the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch and Rome have erred in living, in manner of ceremonies and also in matters of Faith, as though these four alone were characterized by these unfortunate delinquencies or mistakes, it happily says no more as to the bearing that these errors may have on our relations with them.

I lay stress on this because it is frequently taken for granted that the Church of England does not permit certain acts which imply a recognition of fellowship in the Church, and that to perform these acts is to act unlawfully and contrary to the laws and regulations of the Church of England. I entirely repudiate that position and claim that whatever force the Creeds and Articles and rubrical directions of the Prayer Book have for English Churchmen, they are entirely domestic and concern our own Church, its membership and ministry only, and do not directly or indirectly carry an implication as to how we ought to behave ourselves to others. The not infrequently hinted suggestion that

it is disloyal not to observe an attitude to those of other denominations based on the universal application of these laws and regulations, I altogether refuse to endorse.

The third and perhaps the chief argument for treating episcopacy as essential is to be found in the claim for unity as one of the most distinctive marks of the Christian Church : that the Church is meant to be one and that all breaches of unity are sinful and contrary to God's will. By the term 'our unhappy divisions,' it is assumed that divisions in the order of the Christian society are in themselves mischievous and ought to be mended, and the line of amendment is to be found in the acceptance of a common order and Creed of which Episcopacy must be the badge. But in working for a unity of this sort and on these lines, as it is worked for in the Church of England, and as one may surely say is demanded by the Church of Rome, are we not largely missing the mark? St. Paul certainly exhorted the Corinthians to 'speak the same thing,' to be 'perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment'; but the whole matter was then in its early stages and the truth of Christ as it presented itself to the Apostle and the Corinthian Christians was a comparatively simple matter. To read into that counsel the exhortation to maintain as a part of Christian loyalty complete agreement in the development of even the fundamentals of Christian thought and policy is to stretch it far beyond reasonable bounds. And it is evident enough, as one follows out the description, that what was working mischief was not honest difference of view in matters of doctrine and discipline, but simply party spirit as we meet it to-day, based on grounds of personal feeling and animated by the personal envy and spite that so often mar even distinguished groups of well-meaning persons.

I cannot think that there is any real prospect of securing reunion with the Free Churches on a footing of Episcopacy and the Nicene Creed, nor do I think it would be worth much if it were so secured. This does not seem to me the kind of unity that Christ had in mind if He did indeed pray 'that they all may be one, even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee,' the thought of which is entirely in accord with His mind and teaching whether He gave it original expression in those precise words or not. Can we say that the historic Church before the division

of East and West, or before the newer Churches of the Reformation were formed, was free of all sense of division and in its unity gave a compelling witness to the word? Was its all-pervading authority among the Christian nations a better means of overcoming evil or of advancing the cause of the Kingdom of God than is the influence of the Christian Churches with all their diversity to-day? Are the so-called Ages of Faith so commendable? Is there anything in the mere acceptance of one form and one order that will really bring conviction to mankind? I do not see that it has done so in the past and I cannot bring myself to think that it would do so in the future

I have dealt with this question of Episcopacy at some length because it appears to me to be on the whole the most controversial of the points urged as essential to unity; but very similar considerations apply to the question of the Nicene Creed, as another thing the endorsement of which is made essential to unity. Without going into that now it is enough to say that I think the approach ought to be on entirely different lines; that instead of endeavouring to secure a unity of organization, what we ought to seek is simply a unity of spirit, finding in the presence of the Spirit of Christ a bond which will in fact unite all who profess and call themselves Christians, in comparison with which a unity of organization is really a matter of very small consequence; or rather may it not be said that where that unity of the Spirit is realized it will find its own method of expression and that till it has been found the effort to organize a unity is bound to fail, or if it did not fail the unity achieved would be found to possess no real or lasting worth?

It will of course be urged that this is all very well as an ideal to have in our minds and that if we could look into one another's hearts it might be possible to construct a fellowship upon it, and in that case there would perhaps be no need for organization at all. That is of course true, but it is worth noting that in spite of its intangible quality it was that unity of spirit on which the Apostles seemed sometimes to go, and that at all events it was just that that sprang from our Lord's teaching and would seem to be in accordance with His mind; and we all from time to time rest upon it. For ourselves in this imperfect world, where we cannot look upon the heart, it is the profession of the effort to

live by the Spirit of Christ that we must accept as genuine, and that, with the frequent reminder of the need of living as we profess, is exactly what we all seek in the inner life of our own separate Churches.

With these things in mind it is high time that I addressed myself to my main subject, what the relations between the Church of England and other Churches ought to be and how we ought to regard them.

There is little that I need say as to our relations with the Church of Rome or the Eastern Church, and perhaps it was not meant that I should concern myself with them. As to Rome, as long as Rome is what it is no relations are possible except those of human friendliness, not because we should have any objection to formulating the means of approach, but because it is evident that nothing would be accepted but on terms that we should be compelled altogether to reject. But we are learning to establish everywhere a friendship among the members of the various Christian communions, and great advances have been made happily during the lifetime of many of us. These ought by all means to be cultivated and we ought to lose no opportunity of friendly intercourse. Prejudice and a certain apprehension still stand very much in the way, preventing full understanding and the spread of sympathy.

As to the Eastern Church, I speak with some hesitation, partly because I know too little about that Church and partly because eminent Churchmen for whose opinions I have great respect apparently think some form of official recognition and perhaps eventually union with the East to be a possible and desirable thing. The thoughts that occur to me in this connection concern the value of the approach and its repercussion. It seems to me that the Eastern Church is so remote from us that very little consequence would result from any authoritative invitation to intercommunion, for example; that the persons who would wish or be able to take advantage of it are so small a number as to be negligible; though of course some formal act in the direction of unity might have an effect in the East and elsewhere that I have no means of judging of. On the other hand I should be rather afraid of the result on our relations with the Free Churches of any explicit recognition of inter-

communion between the Eastern Church and ourselves. Any closer relations there would be dearly bought, which made our relations with the Free Churches more difficult. Moreover, the steps proposed to be taken are precisely of that mistaken character, as I regard them, towards recognition and a fuller unity based on considerations of organization, doctrinal statement, the nature of the Sacraments, etc. As long as a distinction is made between our relations to the Episcopal Churches and the non-episcopal, as is done in the Report on Unity of the last Lambeth Conference, we seem to be taking this mistaken line. We need to get rid of that distinction.

Our relations to the Free Churches present us with a possible and exceeding fruitful field, where much awaits our doing, and in connection with which the next few years will surely determine whether as a Church we are really to go forward towards a position of influence that may count for much in the world, or find ourselves gradually falling more and more out of touch with the main stream of the intellectual and spiritual life of the nation.

I have already remarked on the considerable advance in friendly relations (and it has taken place on both sides), due in no small measure to the influences for which the Modern Churchmen's Union stands : a better knowledge of Christianity, its documents and its sources, of the difference between the things that really matter and those which do not, of where spiritual values lie, wherein the instinctive sense of the less trained part of the community appears to me sometimes to feel the way better than the cultivated minds of the theologians. As an illustration of this more friendly attitude our own Church may be cited. Friendship has marked the relations between the groups therein in an extraordinarily helpful way. We learn to listen patiently to views that seem to us quite wrong, stated forcibly, and to anticipate a like patient hearing for ourselves, and we find in the cultivation of a gentle, reasonable, forbearing, truth-seeking spirit of fellowship a real bond. This is the spirit that characterizes, very happily, many of our relations with members of other Churches as it does the groups in our own communion. We need more of it and a more explicit expression of it.

Secondly, we must recognize a position of real equality of

status as between other Churches and ourselves. We are very far as yet from having arrived at that recognition. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 acknowledged quite definitely 'all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ, which is His Body.' That was a very great advance.

It definitely regards Presbyterians, Methodists and other bodies of Free Churchmen as part of the Catholic Church; for that is what I understand the term 'universal Church of Christ' to mean. I do not know what else it means. That, I say, was a very considerable advance: but there seems to have been great reluctance to act on the implications of that acknowledgment. The Free Churches are still too often regarded as in a position of inferiority—irregular, lacking essential qualities of a true Churchmanship, to be treated with a measure of condescension. To gain adherents for ourselves from them seems a worthy ambition and a cause of satisfaction. These are things to be overcome. There must be a frank recognition of the full equality of standing between ourselves and them. That a man prefers one denomination to another, that he likes the type of worship better, that it possesses a stronger appeal for him, are quite good grounds for his belonging to one or the other, and till we all get a long way further in recognizing this our fellowship is not likely to be very much increased.

Then there are the two matters on which considerable and strong differences of opinion exist—the interchange of pulpits and intercommunion. Let me say at once that in using these terms it seems to me we ought to mean exactly what they say—interchange of pulpits, intercommunion; not merely the invitation to a Nonconformist minister to preach occasionally in one of our churches and the admission to the Holy Communion with us of such Free Churchmen as present themselves, but actual reciprocity, we as ready and as free to go to them as they to come to us. What is the hindrance to this? Nothing that I can see in the Prayer Book, which is our own domestic Book containing the orders, the Services and the basis of belief in the Church of England, and perfectly compatible with a free intercourse with other Christian Churches whose ordinations and ser-

vices may be on other lines and whose beliefs may not have this form of expression given to them. Prejudice is certainly in the way; the application of particular points of our own teaching and practice to other bodies, the old assumption, which is indeed the Roman one, that Episcopacy is essential to the Church and that unity is to be achieved through organization.

And let me say quite definitely here that I include among these bodies with whom this frank recognition should be expressed that body of Christians that calls itself Unitarian. It follows logically from my view that a doctrinal basis, whatever value it may possess in our separate communions, is not a proper basis on which to define our attitude to other branches of the great Christian Church. I do not consider myself qualified to pronounce an opinion on the great Arian controversy or to decide whether the Athanasian victory did secure a supremacy for Christ that another conclusion would have left impaired. As I read the story of that controversy there seem to me few historic instances that do more to fortify the critics who quote with a sinister sarcasm, 'see how these Christians love one another.' Whatever was won for doctrine very badly supported the claim of the spirit to be the conquering force in the world. If the Church could have let the doctrine go, on no other ground but a magnanimous resolve to let love triumph over difference of opinion, the gain to the world might have been incalculable. To-day at all events I unhesitatingly prefer to take my stand on the Prayer Book phrase, recognizing a fellowship in the Christian Church of 'all who profess and call themselves Christians.' I think we always lose when we allow that to be modified by our zeal for the unique position and glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. He will retain His position by virtue of His own spirit, and I cannot but think that His own comment on our controversy would be that to those of His disciples whose righteous indignation displayed itself on a memorable occasion, 'Ye know not what spirit ye are of.' I cannot believe that He would ever have refused the title of followers to those who showed the mind of Christ in love of God and love of man for His sake, and who manifested their love in service.

Actually, I suppose, progress in the direction in which I hope it will come will only be made as individuals take steps in that

direction. It is too much to expect authoritative pronouncements, at least at present. Among Englishmen, responsible bodies always tend to be cautious, and religious systems are by nature conservative; these factors will generally tend to bring in authoritative pronouncements on the heels of advancing opinion. But I am sure we need to make advances in the directions I have indicated and certainly to express our hearty desire for a fuller use of them.

I have spoken with complete frankness. A Modern Churchmen's Conference is accustomed to this and could hardly be justified without it. If the particular attention which is sometimes given to the utterances of individual bishops may suggest the need of guarded and even reticent expression, we are repeatedly reminded, on the other hand, how much the Christian Church loses because those whose position claims for their utterances rather more publicity than falls to the lot of some others, do not express their whole mind clearly and fully.

To sum up, my contention is that we are mistaken in the effort to constitute a unity of Christians on the footing of a united organization distinguished by certain marks of order, doctrine and practice in the hope that through it that unity of the spirit which is the ultimate aim of us all may grow and exercise its influence on the world. My position is that we need to go the other way about, to manifest and seek the Spirit of Christ, and wherever we find it, to recognize without any misgiving in any body possessing it, a true place in the Christian fellowship, to let that fellowship find expression in such interchange of ministry as may be convenient and in a common approach to the Lord's Table; and that only out of a fellowship so nurtured will spring whatever external bonds of union the whole body of the Church needs to work its Lord's work in the world.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS IT MIGHT BE

By the Rev. C. G. Challenger, M.A., Hulsean Prizeman; author of *The Excellence of Revealed Religion.*

THE modern man believes that there is a God, but finds it hard to believe in a God who acts and affects his life and cares for him — a living God. It is to science that the man of to-day says, 'How manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast thou made them all; the earth is full of thy riches.' To the economic system, not to God, he says in fear and trembling, 'The eyes of all wait upon thee and thou givest them their meat in due season.' Yet all the time man retains his need for religion.

The Humanist meets this situation by saying, 'Let us have religion without God.' But such religion will never prove satisfying. The soul of man is unconsciously athirst for the living God. Our Church must show him God at work, and bring about a time when once more the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork.

It must be the task of the Church's scholars and teachers to give back to the Englishman faith in the living God. We all hope that the Church will go back to Jesus, to His ideals, His way of worshipping and His way of treating others. But He took for granted belief in a living God, and that has been lost to-day. It must first be recovered. Given a God, it is natural to worship Him and to serve Him.

The Church must be then a body in which the living God is seen to dwell, and in which the Master's ideals are put into practice.

Who shall belong to this Church of the living God? The idea is attractive of a Church of saints, a compact band of the children of light, believing the same things and fighting shoulder to shoulder against the rest of the world, the kingdom of darkness. Unfortunately for this ideal, after nineteen hundred years of Christianity the spiritual state of those who do not confess Christ is not wholly dark, and it is not easy to separate the children of light from the children of darkness.

What is needed is a practical test, or rather a practical qualification, which will be concerned with the aim rather than the actual standing of the member. Here it is worth while to consider a movement which has unity and a strong band of loyalty, the Scout Movement. A purely practical declaration is required: 'I promise to do my best to serve God and the King, to help other people at all times and to obey the Scout Law.' The most important words here are 'to do my best.' What else should be needed in the Church than a promise 'to do my best to follow Christ'? And if it is necessary in the interests of discipline to determine whether or not a member is carrying out his promise we have our Lord's touchstone, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'

A few years ago it would perhaps have seemed strange to contemplate a national Church in the future; would there not be a world Church? But so long as there are different nations it will be desirable that there shall be national literatures, national art and national Churches. But there will be complete understanding between the national Churches when they are all founded upon truth and the desire to follow Jesus only. But how can there be a truly national Church of England? It is possible that guidance may be forthcoming from the past. Our Lord Himself belonged to such a national Church. He did not quarrel with its constitution but only with one of the parties in it.

Dr. R. H. Charles has shown how well adapted the Jewish Church was to be a spiritual home for all Jews everywhere. It was established, that is to say, it was recognized, by the Government as a national institution, and the governor was there to see fair play between the parties in the Church. It admitted the widest differences of belief. The priests themselves did not believe in immortality, whereas the Puritan party believed in it strongly. But there was unity of spirit in the worship of the same God. There was unity in diversity; and this Church was truly catholic, as no Christian Church has been since the Reformation.

> 'The Jewish Church, prior to A.D. 70, could open its doors to all the spiritually-minded men of the nation, but no Christian Church since the Reformation can make any such claim. For, since all stages of development from the agnostic attitude of the Sadducee to the most spiritually conceived creed of the Pharisee were represented and recog-

nized as alike tenable in Judaism when an established Church, it follows that the Jewish Church attained a degree of comprehensiveness that the entire Christian Church, Anglican and Protestant, Greek and Roman combined, cannot rival.'[1]

We can understand our Lord's love of His national Church. It was not perfect, but it was worth cherishing. He had severe things to say about the legalistic party in the Church, and it was this party which triumphed after the destruction of the Jewish State and Temple.

'When it ceased to be an established Church with the destruction of the Temple by the Romans, the liberty of interpretation in a spiritual and progressive sense was suppressed, Judaism lost its comprehensiveness, the legalistic party succeeded in crushing every rival form of religious thought and worship, and so Judaism became in its essentials a mere sect.'[2]

Dr. Charles points out that in refraining from laying stress on dogmatic questions in His own teaching, our Lord was exemplifying the full-orbed comprehensiveness of His national Church.

'Nor,' says this author, 'do we find Him frequently testing His followers as to their creed, expelling one as a sceptic and inhibiting another as an unbeliever. Sceptics they were one and all during their time of tutelage, a genuine society of doubters. But doubt and uncertainty, so long as they were honest, our Lord always treated with the utmost consideration, whereas He had nought but reproofs for the children of the untrimmed lamp, the unused talent, the ungirded loin: and nought but denunciation for those who saw their neighbour naked and clothed him not, sick and visited him not, repentant and forgave him not.'[3]

A truly Catholic Church, a Church open to all the spiritually-minded men and women of the nation. It has been possible once before, in Judaism; might it not be possible again?

A Church of England as comprehensive as this would welcome back to its bosom all the bodies which have become separated from it in the past. There would be 'home reunion.' Even now there is an absence of ill-feeling between the Churches, and a good deal of co-operation, made possible by the fact that the harvest is now so plenteous that the labourers can work without treading on one another's heels. Already, too, outside the Churches, there is a reverence for Christ, even where there is dislike of His followers. Whereas in the Jewish Church

[1] R. H. Charles, *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments*, p. 178.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 182.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 180.

the law was the object of common loyalty, in the reunited Church Jesus will be Lord, and in the service of Jesus will be used all the treasures of English Christianity: things new and old. The old will be the things that have stood the test of time: the English Bible and Prayer-book; the great hymns; music from all periods when England produced good music; the beautiful churches; the customs and traditions of English Christianity. The new things will be the products of the new learning, the new outlook and the enhanced capabilities of man. The new Church would be no nebulous body in which everyone whittled down his own convictions to suit his neighbour. That is what happens now when there is an intellectual test. Men now tend to restrain their thoughts for fear of being led outside the pale or for fear of unsettling others. Freedom of thought is not yet respectable. This does not even lead to unity of spirit. All must have noticed how much easier it is to feel in spiritual unity with those who emphatically disagree with us: we gratefully accept what ground is common to us both. It is those who nearly agree with us that make us irritable and unfriendly. They are so nearly right, they might be quite right — surely there is some inexcusable cussedness in them. Already sound learning — sound in the sense of being based on right principles, not in the sense of leading to prescribed conclusions — is producing a great measure of agreement in religion. There *are* 'assured results.' But distress is caused because, as it is, a Christian is a man who has to believe something about everything, instead of a follower of Christ who can be known by His fruits.

In the future Church there will be a distinction between religious knowledge that is a useful guide for everyday life, and knowledge that may be left exclusively to scholars. It is not necessary for the ordinary believer to have an opinion about everything. Learning will know its place. In the past a good deal of transcendental learning has found its way even into common worship. The mistake has been to suppose that every statement which employs the name of God is a religious statement. It may be simply a theological one.

We may look forward to a time when the Church services are 'incisive and relevant.'[4] At present any schoolboy with some

[4] D. Hankey, *The Lord of all Good Life*, p. 128.

knowledge of history, theology, liturgiology and etymology can be sure of profiting by the Prayer-book services; and a cultivated man and good son of the Church of England like A. C. Benson can explain in a beautiful way the *rationale* of a Cathedral performance of Morning Prayer. But not everyone can do this. Many have never known any other experience than being swept peacefully along by the holy words and music of the service without its meaning very much to them.

In the ideal Church of England people will know why they come to church. At present they are not quite sure, except on certain occasions. Why do they flock to Harvest Festival services? Because they know exactly what they have come for — to thank God for their food. The hymns, the prayers, the decorations are the expression of the people's thanks. On Armistice Sunday there is a similar understanding of the meaning of the service. Confirmation classes should be considered in the same connection. They are resorted to with great seriousness because they have a definite object; they deal with the dedication of one's life to God. Could not every service have an obvious meaning?

In the past, the Church services have been *there*, and the Church has gone to great trouble in Sunday School, Day School and Bible Class to explain the services and accustom young people to them. But would it not be simpler to find out men's spiritual interests and to build up on them? These interests would not always be articulate. It would often be a case of 'Whom ye worship in ignorance, him I declare unto you.' The Church of the future will work from the man to the service.

In the conduct and composing of services, progress lies in the recognition that this is an art. Already authors write about *The Principles of Religious Ceremonial* and *The Art of Public Worship*. This shows that the subject is being treated objectively. In the past, enrichments of the services have often been associated with reactionary teaching, and it has been difficult to have beauty without medievalism. It is being recognized now that there are principles. There is a much better understanding of the past (the real past, not an imaginary one), and this has helped to make the principles of the art of worship clear, and available for application to new needs. It will now be possible

to use all kinds of beauty in the services. The way is open to a progressive art which will reverence the past and learn its lessons, yet not be tied to it.

It is evident to all that there must be a greater variety in services. In a catholic Church of England there will be all types of men and women. Three kinds of services will probably be used.

(1) Prayer-book services, revised, in their integrity. All the members of the reunited Church will be glad to use these on occasion, but it will be recognized that they cannot be used with profit by the same people Sunday after Sunday. A Free Churchman once remarked that he had much enjoyed the Church of England service he had been to, but that the prospect of an infinite vista of such services appalled him. They do not appal those who are accustomed to them, but they probably are bad for them. Morning and Evening Prayer will come to be regarded very much as religious dramas in which it is good to have taken part. They will be beautifully read and performed with as much music, and only as much, as can be adequately done. Choral Matins with Sermon, the residue of the traditional Matins, Litany and Ante-Communion of the reformed Church of England, is the least satisfactory of our Sunday services. Mr. Hardwick thinks that its culminating rite of the Elevation of the Almsdish, when impressively carried out, is best calculated to 'set forward to all men the profoundly true doctrine of the sacredness of money'[5] — not a specifically Christian doctrine. Probably Matins will become once more a morning instead of a mid-day service. A short service with hymns and sermon will be held towards the middle of the day.

(2) Services of the Prayer-book type, built up largely out of the elements of the Prayer-book, will be increasingly used. The Jubilee service is a happy example of this type.

(3) There will also be entirely free services, using definitely modern language. The attempt to mix the Prayer-book type with a freer type of service leads to unreality. College servants have to be alluded to as 'those who minister to our needs.' It seems impossible to call a spade a spade.

[5] *The Professional Christian*, p. 99.

In the reunited Church, the parish church, usually older than the Free Church buildings, which no doubt retain its primacy. In it all the various types of service would have to be used in turn so as to promote unity amongst the worshippers in the parish. It was for this reason that Dr. Arnold in his scheme for Church reform and reunion proposed that there should be only one church in a parish. He instanced the Deuteronomic reformation amongst the Jews. Some way at any rate would have to be found of preserving unity, or the last state would be little better than the first. Using different types of services the parish church would, as it were, be sometimes New College Chapel and sometimes the House of God,[6] and the gain would be great.

The Holy Communion would be celebrated both in the beautiful Prayer-book form and in a freer way. It might be the most impressive and satisfying of all the services. In the past it has suffered from many drawbacks — association with sub-Christian theories, over-literal interpretation of the words of Jesus, St. Paul's remark about eating and drinking our own damnation, and the impression that it is for good people only and preferably for women. If all the bad associations could be forgotten, the Epistles and Gospels revised, and some unsuitable phrases removed, it would appear as a drama in which we think of ourselves as Jesus' disciples, feel Him near and dedicate ourselves to His service.

In offering Baptism, Marriage, Churching and Burial to all, the Church of England already shows a wide charity; and these services are already the means of bringing those outside into closer touch with the Church. But the offices are too full of the fossils of dead beliefs. It would be an enormous gain to have the fossils dug out and these services too made incisive and relevant.

In our materialistic and un-Christian jargon we talk of man-power. Let us not use this word, but ask, How shall the ministry of the new Church be organized? We should be wise to keep the parochial system, because it imposes duties which the mem-

[6] 'But surely I may lift up my voice and sing in the House of God!'
'House of God be damned! This is New College Chapel.'

bers of the Church must show to those outside, and prevents the Church from becoming a cosy sect. 'The parochial system secures to every parish the greatest blessing of human society, that is, the constant residence of an individual who has no other business than to do good of every kind to every person.' So wrote Dr. Arnold in 1834. In many parishes 'an individual' is no longer sufficient, and curates simply duplicate the incumbent; nor in any parish is it any longer desirable that the burden of doing spiritual good (for that is the chief part of the task) should fall upon one man. What is needed is not a multiplication of priests, but a return to the New Testament system of a ministry of varied gifts. Home reunion would provide from the outset in many parishes a team of men of various gifts who had been the ministers of the various uniting churches, and with these could be associated other men and women of all classes. It would not be quite what we have been used to. Many people are not accustomed to taking their religion from anyone who is not officially a representative of God, officially good, and officially a gentleman. But in the Church of the future we may look forward to the disappearance of the idea that religion is a commodity to be handed down by a superior authority. It will be regarded as a following of Jesus in which help can be given by men and women whose personal qualities or experience or education gives them the power to help.

The new Church of England will find missionary work to do both at home and abroad. The Church would rely upon the power of truth. It would not use 'propaganda,' for that implies playing tricks with other people's souls, and forcing beliefs upon them by psychological machinery. Much educational use is already made of the radio. More use would be made of it by a united Church. Some use is already made of the cinema. Great things could be done. We know that there can be no complete life of Jesus, but would it not be splendid to have a gospel according to the cinema? We could show our Lord alive upon the screen and make Him real. The radio and the cinema would be used honestly as *media* of instruction. In the past such things have been used as jam to induce people to swallow the powder of religion. This faithless attitude will be abandoned. Truth will make its own way if it is given a chance, and will prevail.

In regard to foreign missions, the doubt whether we ought to thrust our own religion upon people of different faiths is already yielding to the conception of the whole world as the field for Jesus' message. But the question is still alive in many minds whether what is being taught is really Jesus' message or a sectarian or Anglicized or Europeanized version of it. We may hope that in the Church of the future there will be no ground for this doubt. Sound learning will be allowed to determine what the message really is, and the converts will be left to interpret the message in their own way.

The future Church of England would be able to sponsor a national system of religious education. No longer would it be necessary to 'save' a school here and there; the ideal of the education of the whole man could be realized everywhere. Knowing that the subject would be treated soundly, authority would see that its teachers were properly trained in the imparting of religious knowledge. It would be recognized indeed that *religion* is caught, not taught; but religious knowledge — that is, comparative religion, the structure of the Bible, the history of dogma and the history of the Church — can be taught by any competent teacher. The State would provide chaplains, or would make it the responsibility of the parish church to see to the religious training of the children. In these and other ways will the future Church of England build up a truly Christian nation.

I have tried, out of a limited experience, to hold up an ideal and to make some suggestions. This paper has not shown how these things may be brought to pass: it is the privilege of the visionary to leave such considerations aside. Questions of Church government and organizations have hardly been touched upon, though they are very important in England. Foreigners look with amazement at the prominent place we give them. But these difficulties can be settled. The ingenious *Sketch of a United Church* is a hopeful sign. Yet it is not healthy to dwell on our difficulties in this sphere. Psychologists tell us that by concentrating upon difficulties we increase them. We must 'look away' ὑποβλέπω—as the Greek-speaking apostolic writers said. Let us fix our eyes upon the ideal, and present difficulties will gradually be surmounted.

Then will come the day to which the Student in Arms looked forward.

> 'When all beauty and all simplicity are found in worship; when all vain traditions and sophistries are done away with; when its teaching is clear and practical and simple, and proved by its results, when it fights all its foes and recognizes all its allies; when it includes all classes; when it has a way of salvation for all sinners; when love and humility abound — then the Church will be the Catholic Church, the body of Christ.'[7]

They are the words of one who, had he lived, would most probably have been here at this conference. The voice of Donald Hankey, coming out of the past, may serve to strengthen those who are striving to-day to make the Church of England what it might be.

[7] *The Lord of all Good Life*, p. 161.

THE MODERNIST'S TASK IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By Douglas White, M.A., M.D.

AFTER the remarkable discourses which you have enjoyed, this finishing address by such an one as myself will remind you, as it does me, of Horace's description of the mermaid, 'The beautiful form of a woman tails off into a fish.' Yet even the fish's tail, I suppose, helped the mermaid to reach her destination.

What indeed is the task of the Modernist to-day in the Church of England? Not, I think, the massing of a party, nor the beating of a drum, nor even, as yet, the formulation of a system of doctrine. Our orthodox critics tell us that we don't know whither we are heading; perhaps there is some truth in their contention that we have not grasped the full significance of our mental attitude. And I think that, in some important directions, we have not thought deep enough. There are many deposits of gold in the Christian mine which we have not yet discovered, far less explored. Our task to-day is to think out the deeper implications of liberal theology. I wish then to touch upon some of the cardinal points of Christian thought toward which the younger generation are groping their way, so far as they feel the urgency of a new religious orientation. If the thoughts which I am about to express go beyond or dissent from the opinions of those from whom I have learnt, such heresies are personal to myself.

We are often charged with a barren intellectualism which lacks the vitality of religious emotion. My experience of these Conferences, year after year, and the character of those whom I meet, does not bear out the accusation. It is just because of our religious aspirations that we seek new aspects of truth. The charge of excessive intellectualism might as well, or even better, be levelled against the fearsome intellectual complexity of the Nicene or Athanasian creeds, from which many religious minds to-day turn away in despair, seeking relief in emotional by-paths and leaving the intellectual tangles to the professional minds

to unravel. We are not content with that; we find it necessary to love the Lord our God with our minds as well as with our hearts.

The opponents of Modernism seem to think that its aim is negation and destruction of religious truth. To them it seems that we are sawing off the branch on which we, and they, are sitting: that we are scuttling the Christian ship. That is a radical misconception; yet one which, from my own early experience, I can understand. Time was when I violently resented modernist ways of thought; but they gripped me and prevailed, for I felt the need of a religion which shall not be subject to the batterings of scientific and historical knowledge and which shall stand in its own right, hand in hand with them. I wanted more, not less, Christianity. The object of Modernism is not to destroy but to rebuild. The traditional edifice has crumbled; it can no longer house the modern-thinking mind and conscience. I, for one, am convinced that, apart from a vital religion, our present civilization will crash. The re-teaching of Christ's religion will be a long and difficult job, but it is the only way to recovery. Many of you will be feeling as I do, that my own religion has become a more real and vital thing since I have thrown overboard the heavy deck-cargoes which had shifted and threatened to overturn my ship. We cannot be chained to the intellectual categories of the first, fourth or sixteenth centuries. Indeed, if we reckon the age of Christianity by centuries, instead of years, it is not yet of age—it is only nineteen. Perhaps it has arrived at the age of indiscretion. But, indiscreet or not, it is asking questions and it demands answers.

Jesus told the Scribes that they had locked the door of knowledge and run away with the key. But now others beside Churchmen have forged keys of knowledge: if leading eccleciastics will not unlock the doors, others are doing it. In plain words, obscurantism, whether deliberate or merely conventional, will not do any longer. Problems have to be tackled openly and decisively. Christianity cannot breathe in the strait-waistcoat of ancient formularies.

But I wish to be specific and to avoid further generalities. I propose to touch upon three matters in particular, and to limit myself to them—Atonement, Resurrection, Incarnation. In each of these I desire to get down to bed-rock, to seek out what we

really mean by the words. Eschewing ambiguity, let us say what we mean and mean what we say; at the same time humbly realizing that even the most ignorant of us is not infallible, and the most learned but an infant crying for the light.

First then of the three, I select the subject of Atonement, partly because it was through consideration of this subject that my own whole religious outlook was redirected; partly because it has in the past formed an integral part of a formalized scheme of 'salvation' which in all its historical shapes, has become obsolete, forcing us to get right back to first principles. The teachings of the Atonement in history can be stated quite crisply, and they are all centred on the death of Jesus rather than on His life. The doctrine has assumed, roughly, four forms: (1) The death of Christ regarded as a payment by God to the Devil; this was a bold, if strange, conception, and, surprisingly enough, it was dominant for some eight hundred years. (Irenaeus, Origen.) (2) The death of Christ as a rectification of the upset moral equilibrium of the world, and a satisfaction to God for the personal affront of sin. (Anselm.) (3) Christ's death as a substituted penalty for the sin of the world — the doctrine of vicarious punishment. (Luther, Calvin.) And (4) its recent, and less unpalatable variant, which represents Christ's life and death as securing man's forgiveness by means of vicarious penitence. (Moberly, Mozley.) Now of these four — and they have been, roughly speaking, the four main varieties of the doctrine in history — the first three are no longer tenable by thoughtful minds. The last holds attractions for many, but to my way of thinking it holds no advantage over substitutionary penalty. You may be sorry for the wrong-doing of someone whom you like, or even whom you dislike, but you cannot repent of sins which you have not committed; penitence is a strictly personal affair. Repentance is the way to recovery; you cannot recover from a disease you have never had. Neither punishment nor penitence can be vicarious.

Now, you will all agree that of these four interpretations, each is strikingly different from the others: but they have all one basic element in common. Man has sinned and some sort of satisfaction is required, either by the Devil or God — in

modern times only by God, since Anselm put the Devil out of court long ago. Is this concept of satisfaction to God finished with to-day? Not formally, at any rate; for it still finds expression in our own prayer of Consecration; it is implicit in a large proportion of popular preaching; to the ecclesiastical mind it is implicit in the notion of 'priest' and 'altar.'

Now I am fully convinced that this whole idea of satisfaction as a preliminary to forgiveness is in flat contradiction of the actual teaching of Christ Himself. He went about scattering God's forgiveness freely to every penitent soul — forgiveness unconditional and without limit; no thought, so far as can be seen, of any required satisfaction or punishment. We are to forgive freely till seventy-times seven, as God does. Do you remember? 'Her sins which are many, are all forgiven.' Why? Just 'because she loved much.' How then did the idea of satisfaction enter? Clearly, it would seem, St. Paul was unable to banish from his mind, in spite of considerable transformation, the categories of the sacrificial system. Nor can we deny that some suspicion of this thought is present in the text of *Matthew*, and even, to a less extent, in *Mark*,[1] but it is so contradictory of Jesus's doctrine of free forgiveness that it can only be regarded as a misinterpretation. St. Paul himself touches bottom when he tells his converts, 'Be ye reconciled to God,' and the Johannine writer when he says, 'Not that we loved God but that He loved us.' Indeed, the essence of every true spiritual revival in Christian times has been the assurance of free forgiveness, even though the ground and *rationale* of that free forgiveness has been in many ways misconstrued. If God loved the world He needed no propitiation; the virtue of the self-sacrifice of Jesus, in life and death, is that thereby men's spirits are drawn up into contact with the love of God as reflected therein.

Any and every theory of satisfaction is destructive of true Christian thought. Peter Abelard perceived something of this eight hundred years ago: but then he is not an official saint, and his influence has only revived within living memory. The Atonement is just an at-one-ment, a reconciliation which has to be initiated from our side. God's love is always ready to take us as we are, with all the imperfections of our penitence for evil and

[1] *Mt.* xx, 28 (λύτρον); *Mk.* x, 45; *Mk.* xiv, 24; *Mt.* xxvi, 28.

of our strivings after good. That love was reflected, not procured, by Christ: His 'work' was to reveal the nature of God to His followers.[2] The sense of free forgiveness is the water of life to parched souls, as it is also in the experience of human relationships. Indeed, the freeness of human forgiveness is both the reflexion and the condition of God's. If Christianity is to survive among thoughtful people, satisfaction theories must be jettisoned: they are a deadly cargo.

Next let us pass to the Resurrection. To this meeting I need not labour the matter of the empty tomb. Whatever may be thought of that story, the question of life after death cannot depend on the resurrection of the material corpse. The evidence of such a resurrection in the case of Jesus is full of difficulties. There is no evidence that St. Paul believed in it; he differentiated between the physical and the spiritual body, seeming therein to have trans-shipped from the Hebrew to the Greek style of thinking. But, taking all that for granted, what then do we mean by resurrection? Here is the point I wish to raise, for it gives food for thought. Quite recently I have read articles and books, even in Modernist covers, in which it is constantly said that Christ overcame death, conquered death, banished death. It sounds well, but what does it mean? For the life of me, I cannot tell. Did Christ *invent* immortality? I cannot think it; I cannot even imagine its meaning. Jesus Himself believed in immortality,[3] for God, He said, is not the God of the dead but of the living. He did not regard Himself as the initiator of immortality.

It is, indeed, open to argument whether He Himself, and St. Paul, thought that immortality was conditional on the quality of the earthly life: in *St. Luke*, Jesus is made to speak of those who are made worthy to reach that state, and St. Paul appears to envisage the same idea. But whether this be so or not, immortality was not brought about by Jesus, but, for the Christian world, was brought to *light*, that is, was proved to the satisfaction of the disciples by the appearances after the crucifixion. If it had not been for those appearances, the Christian Church, in

[2] 'I have revealed thy name . . . I have finished the work.'—*John* xvii, 4-6.

[3] *Mk.* xii, 26, and parallels.

all probability, would never have existed. Now, if the actual human flesh of Jesus was not revived, He must have appeared as a disembodied, or a differently embodied, spirit. To-day it is asserted that His case was not unique, that the spirits of those who have died do, or may, make themselves evident to the senses, whether eyes or ears, of survivors. I have had no experience of spiritualistic or psychical phenomena; yet it puzzles me to hear it stated, on high religious authority, quite recently, that if such appearances after death could be proved beyond doubt to exist, this would be of no advantage to religious faith. For myself, I think the gain would be inestimably great, for it would convince all and sundry that physical death is not the end of human personality. (This indeed might operate by means of fear as well as of hope. Fear is rightly regarded as a relatively unworthy motive; it is distinctly so if it is actuated by merely selfish considerations. But in social life hopes and fears are wonderfully interwoven; perhaps we may thank God, quite often, for mixed motives.) Such a conviction would, it seems, raise the whole current of human thought and outlook to a higher and more spiritual level: it might indeed do for us, in our different circumstances, what the appearances of Christ did for His original followers. The well-grounded hope of a happy personal activity after death would be a powerful consolation to those who have loved and lost, as well as a potent stimulus to the higher life in this humbler sphere. It would remove the future life from the realm of speculation to that of knowledge.

What is the upshot of this short argument? Just that, while the character of Jesus was admittedly unique in human history, His appearance after death was not necessarily unique, but only more striking in manner and more congruous to His character than that of any other before or since. It was the evidence of life after death that gave vitality to the Christian religion, combined as it was with the assurance of the love of God. Perhaps love and life are just different spellings of the one thing that matters.

For my last theme I take the Incarnation. I take it last because its meaning affects radically the whole Christian field of thought. What do we mean by the Incarnation? Here again we

are faced with a recorded story, the story of the Virgin Birth. This story is only given unequivocally in the First Gospel, if we regard the special words[4] in the Third Gospel as of doubtful authenticity. Many of us here believe that this story is a later accretion to the Gospel history, especially since it is never mentioned or even hinted at in the preaching of the *Acts* or in the Pauline epistles. It represents an explanation of the title Son of God which would appeal to the general — mostly pagan — mentality of the latter years of the first century. Quite different is the interpretation given by St. Mark; here we are shown that the mission of Jesus dawned upon Him at His Baptism, when He saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit entering into Him, and heard the voice 'Thou art my beloved son, this day have I begotten thee'; and that is a well-attested text of St. Luke. This would seem to many a more satisfying concept of the Divine Sonship than the Matthean.

Loisy and others consider that St. Paul gives a third interpretation when he says that Jesus was declared to be the Son of God with power by the Resurrection. Loisy thinks this was earlier even than the Markan. And the Fourth Gospel gives a fourth interpretation — that of the Logos becoming flesh — a philosophic idea of the thought of God becoming interfused in a human personality. Our sometime President, Dean Rashdall, considered that this idea was intended to exclude the Virgin Birth; Loisy, that it just leaves it out of account. Traditional theology, of course, is satisfied to conflate all the four ideas — a method as easy as it is unsound.

Now it is from the Johannine concept that the word Incarnation has been adopted. What do we mean by it? That, to my thinking, is the crucial question which we all have to face. The Church — and by that I mean not only the Church of England, but the Presbyterian and Free Churches as well — has not faced it. They all accept the Incarnation: they all accept the Divinity of Christ: but if they define it at all, they do so in terms of the Nicene and Athanasian Creed, figures of speech which are unintelligible to the great majority of quite intelligent and devout Christians (or would-be Christians) of to-day. What do we mean by the divinity of Christ? I shall be told, quite

[4] *Lk.* i, 34.

truly, that the Latin for divinity is *deitas* — Godhead. That Jesus was God Almighty, appearing in flesh under human limitations — perfect God and perfect man, equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, inferior to the Father as touching His manhood. Now do we believe that? Is that to be the touchstone of Christianity? That is the real issue for all of us. Is the Divinity of Jesus Christ absolute or derivative? Do we mean Very God of Very God, or do we mean the greatest and finest expression of the Divine under strict and real human conditions? It has got to be faced.

In the Jewish tradition, by which early Christian thought was deeply coloured, the separation between God and man was brought into high relief, while the connecting elements of sympathy and love were blurred or even hardly perceptible: transcendence was magnified, immanence neglected: between God and man a gulf was fixed; if it was to be bridged, the bridge must be manufactured in heaven and let down to earth. God must show Himself in human form. Once this — the Virgin Birth concept — had attained Canonical status, it ceased to be questioned. The canonical books became all alike regarded as 'inspired' and free from substantial error. Such inerrancy was taken for granted at the great Councils; and the Virgin Birth — so it seems to me — became the starting point of all the great questionings, both in the Trinitarian and Christological controversies. If Jesus was born of a virgin, then He must be of the same 'substance' as His Father God: if the virgin was His mother, He must have the human 'substance' too. He must have two natures, human and divine; two manners of will, intelligence, and activity: the controversies raged round the methods of their combination. To us of to-day, both the questions, and the answers given to them, have lost meaning: for us the interest lies not in the antithesis between God and man, but in the points of natural contact; in immanence rather than transcendence. It may be that the pendulum of thought has swung to the other extreme, with the risk of an empty pantheism. But the thought of God-in-us must come home to-day to every religious thinker. We are not alien from God: we are His offspring; in Him we live and move and have our being. The divine spark illumines our lives so far as we are capable of it

or willing to admit it. We vary indefinitely in our capacity for the divine: some few seem born to it; others, like most of us, strive laboriously and intermittently to develop it; many seem hardly aware of the need of it. In Jesus we see a man uniquely imbued with holy spirit, to whom we justly render supreme reverence. Are we to be denied the name of Christian because we cannot repeat the formulas of the fourth and following centuries? Admittedly our position, if thus latitudinarian, is delicate and liable to the pains and penalties of heresy. Yet it is a fact that a majority of thoughtful churchgoers are Modernist in spirit, even if they do not care enough about it to say so. To religion, a blind traditionalism spells death. I am frankly amazed that one of the most learned and able of our bishops should trot out the tattered argument that science and philosophy are continually shifting their ground; that the only fixed and unshifting things are the creeds. True it is that knowledge climbs a slow and zig-zag track; but is it otherwise with religion? Our religious outlook is vastly different, and that for all of us, from that which prevailed fifty years ago. Only the older among us can realize how great is the difference. Why should a fourth or fifth century creed be exempt from the same process? The creeds were but interpretations of the person of Christ, based upon Scripture as it was then understood. The Bible, both Old and New Testament, in the crucible of criticism, has assumed for us a very different aspect. The creeds cannot but share in the same fiery and cleansing procedure. Religion cannot stand still: its face must be turned either to the past or to the future. Remember Lot's wife.

Do we fear that for Christianity change may mean obliteration? I am unafraid. The essence of Christianity is that the character of Jesus was an expression, so far as was possible in a human life, of the character of God. He went about doing good, says *Acts*, for God was with Him. The New Testament never says He was God. He Himself said, 'No one is good save God,' and if He said 'Believe in God, believe also in me,' that was certainly no claim to Godhead. The writers of the Gospels, even of the Fourth Gospel, would be staggered at the language of the Nicene and Athanasian creeds. The Johannine conclusion, God is Love, was that great author's summary of

the life and thought of Jesus. In that belief, if it were general, would lie the salvation of our waterlogged civilization. It is hard enough, sometimes, to believe in God at all; it is only possible if we believe in His Love. That, too, carries with it the happy corollary that the universe is, at bottom, a friendly universe—a conviction of high psychological import to every human being from childhood to age. That is what the world wants, and it is the chief, if not the only, justification of Christian missions. The sonship of Jesus was indeed higher in degree, but still the same in kind, as that by which each of us may aspire to become, in our varying degrees, sons and daughters of God. That is not Nicene orthodoxy, but if it be truth, we can be contented heretics.

I have dealt briefly with three subjects of Christian thought. They can all be subsumed under one category. Love is the password to forgiveness; love the key that opens the gate of life; and love the spirit by which alone men and women can and do become partakers of the Divine nature.

CORRECTION.

In the Editorial Preface of this issue, p. 286, read Walter Travers for Thomas Cartwright.